

F.A.V. Pattenam.
Oct. '22

Price 1s.

Post Free 1s. 2½d.

The
Labour
Speaker's
Handbook.

FACTS AND FIGURES
FOR THE WORKERS.

*The Labour Party,
33, Eccleston Square,
London, S.W. 1.*

FOREWORD

BY THE RIGHT HON. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.

THE political Labour movement has made such rapid headway during the past few years as to be now at the second of the three stages mapped out for it by its pioneers and founders towards the close of the last century. Year by year the pioneers have passed away, but as their number diminished the political movement which they created has grown and expanded, its membership has increased from one hundred thousand to over four and a half millions, its power and influence have been steadily developed. To-day it is a formidable factor in the political life of the nation. And still the movement grows.

When the pioneers set about creating a new and independent political Labour Party, they realised that the new movement would first have to win recognition as a separate and distinct political entity; that later on it would have to establish itself as one of two principal political forces in national life; and then it would be in a position to make serious attempts to capture the reins of government. The years between 1900 and 1914 were the period of propaganda when the movement sought to establish itself as an independent political party in the country and to lay the foundations of Labour representation in Parliament. In the general election of 1900, 15 candidates went to the poll, two were successful, and the aggregate Labour vote was 62,698. The passage of years brought increased strength to the new movement, both in the country and in Parliament. The Labour Representation Committee became the Labour Party, and the Labour Parliamentary Group became the Parliamentary Labour Party. In 1914, at the outbreak of war, the membership of the national movement was, approximately, 1,600,000, and the Parliamentary Labour Party had increased to 39 members.

In 1918 the constitution was revised, and the Labour Party became a definitely national party of workers by hand and brain. At the general election which was held at the end of the same year, 361 Labour candidates went to the poll, 61 were successful, and the aggregate Labour vote was 2,244,945. The affiliated membership reached 3,013,129. At the moment of writing there are 74 members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, and the membership of the

Foreword

National Labour Party totals 4,359,807. Both in the country and in Parliament Labour now constitutes the largest Party in Opposition to the Government, and it is generally conceded in quarters hostile to Labour that the Party is destined in the near future to furnish the Government of the country. It will thus be seen that Labour has reached the second stage in its development and that it is within measurable distance of achieving control of the machinery of government.

All this has been accomplished in the short space of 22 years. It would have been a remarkable achievement in a new country where party prejudices are less firmly fixed, where political traditions count for less in the public mind, and where people are more or less free from old personal and family associations of a political character. But that it should have been done in Great Britain, where political traditions play an important part, where political prejudices are firmly fixed and are uprooted only with great difficulty, and where, despite the democratic spirit of the people, new movements have to contend with a certain innate conservativeness, all this is an accomplishment unequalled in the history of modern politics.

It is not alone in the numerical extension of the Labour Party that one finds ample cause for satisfaction and encouragement. Of perhaps more significance still has been the enlargement and enrichment of the spirit of Labour which has been accompanied by a widening of outlook, a loftier vision, and a clearer perception of the vital needs of humanity. The old criticism that the Labour Party was a class party—a party of manual workers only—concerned principally with questions of hours and wages and industrial conditions, and, consequently, narrow and limited in its outlook, can no longer be justly levelled against it. While the Labour Party has not yet reached its full growth, other parties are either more or less stationary or are actually on the decline. As regards intellectual development, the Labour Party is not sufficiently self-centred or self-satisfied to delude itself into believing that the mind of Labour is full-grown. It is the Party of intellectual curiosity, believing that, if it is to live and thrive and serve, it must be constantly widening its mental horizon. To accept the contrary would mean that a period could be placed to corporate mental growth, that sufficient unto the day is the knowledge thereof. The failure of other parties is to be found in the fact that they are to a large extent the prisoners of their party traditions, that they are content to live on their name and past reputation, each when in opposition trying to outbid the other when in power, and neither being radically different from the other when judged by results.

Foreword

The Labour Party represents a new idea in politics, it embodies a new spirit, and it seeks to set up a new order. Its standard of values differs radically from the standard of the older parties. It is distinguished from these parties mainly because of its faith in a higher order of society, national and international, its belief that human nature is not static but is capable of development to higher levels, and the enthusiasm which inspires all its efforts to give practical effect to the lofty ideals by which it is animated. In international affairs, in commonwealth affairs, in political and economic affairs, Labour represents the human interest, to which all other interests should be subordinate and related, if and when necessary, only to serve and not to control. This is the new order which is aimed at by the policies and principles advocated by the Labour Party.

The pursuance of this aim involves conflict, and for effective fighting ammunition is needed. *THE SPEAKERS' HANDBOOK* is designed in the main to provide the active workers in the Labour movement with the necessary powder and shot to enable them the more effectively to carry on their fight. To a large extent it comprises established facts and figures taken from official or other recognised records. When occasion demands, a supplement bringing certain sections up to date will be issued. As ammunition for the fight *THE SPEAKERS' HANDBOOK* is presented to the movement by the National Executive of the Labour Party, on whose behalf I tender cordial thanks to those who have assisted in its compilation.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WHAT DID THEY SAY?	1
FINANCE	5
LABOUR AND THE RATES	13
TAXATION OF LAND VALUES	16
REPAYMENT OF DEBT	23
ARMAMENTS	25
WASHINGTON CONFERENCE	31
COMMERCIAL POLICY	34
TRUSTS AND COMBINES	36
NATIONALISATION OF RAILWAYS AND MINES	41
UNEMPLOYMENT	50
TRADE BOARDS	60
WASHINGTON CONVENTION	64
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION	67
WAGES AND PROFITS	69
TRADE UNIONS	76
TRADE UNION FINANCES	80
TRADE UNIONS AND EX-SERVICE MEN	83
AGRICULTURE	88
HOUSING	92
EDUCATION	99
MATERNITY	105
PENSIONS FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN	108
OLD AGE PENSIONS	110
DRINK TRAFFIC	111
HOUSE OF LORDS	113
HOUSE OF COMMONS	117
POWER OF THE PRESS	119
VOTES FOR WOMEN	122
IRELAND	125
INDIA	129
EGYPT	131
RUSSIA	135
MESOPOTAMIA	140
COLONIAL FACTS	142
SELF-DETERMINATION	145
MAKING GERMANY PAY	148
OPINIONS ON LABOUR	156
BUDGET FOR 1922-23	158
INDEX	163

The Speakers' Handbook.

WHAT DID THEY SAY?

Coalition Promises.

THE PEACE.—Our first task must be to conclude a just and lasting peace, and so to establish the foundations of a new Europe that occasion for further wars may be for ever averted. . . .

. . . To avert a repetition of the horrors of war, which are aggravated by the onward march of science, it will be the earnest endeavour of the Coalition Government to promote the formation of a League of Nations which may serve not only to ensure society against the calamitous results of militarism, but to further a peaceful mutual understanding between the associated peoples. . . .

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.—The care of the soldiers and sailors . . . is a primary obligation of patriotism, and the Government will endeavour to assist such members of the armed forces of the Crown as may desire to avail themselves of facilities for special industrial training and to return to civil life under conditions worthy of their services to their country.

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

AGRICULTURE AND LAND DEVELOPMENT.—Scientific farming must be promoted, and the Government regard the maintenance of a satisfactory agricultural wage, the improvement of village life, and the development of rural industries as essential parts of an agricultural policy. Arrangements have been made whereby extensive afforestation and reclamation schemes may be entered upon without delay. . . .

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

HOUSING.— . . . One of the first tasks of the Government will be to deal on broad and comprehensive lines with the Housing of the People, which during the war has fallen so sadly into arrears, and upon which the well-being of the nation so largely depends.

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

FISCAL POLICY.— . . . We must endeavour to reduce the war debt in such a manner as may inflict the least injury to industry and credit. . . . The country will need all the food, all the raw materials, and all the credit it can obtain, and fresh taxes ought not to be imposed on food or upon the raw materials of our industry. . . .

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

EMPLOYMENT.— . . . By the development and control in the best interests of the State of the economical production of power and light; of the railways and means of communication; by the improvement of the Consular Service; and by the establishment of regular machinery for consultation with representative trade and industrial organisation on matters affecting the interest and prosperity, output will be increased, new markets opened out, and great economies effected in industrial production.

—(*Coalition Manifesto*—published Nov. 21, 1918.)

The Speakers' Handbook

LLOYD GEORGE PROMISES.

(Issued to the Press Dec. 5, 1918.)

THE KAISER.—The Kaiser must be prosecuted. The war was a crime. Who doubts that? It was a frightful, a terrible crime . . . The men responsible for this outrage on the human race must not be let off because their heads were crowned when they perpetrated the deed.

GERMANY MUST PAY.—All the European Allies have accepted the principle that the Central Powers must pay the cost of the war up to the limit of their capacity. The Allies propose to set up a Commission of experts to examine and report upon the best method of exacting this indemnity from the Central Powers.

THE DEBT OF HONOUR.—The first item in the Government programme is the discharge of the country's debt of honour, I mean the obligation we are under to our gallant soldiers for what they have endured and achieved for Britain. We are under a sacred obligation to the fallen, to the crippled, and to the survivors. . . .

The Government have ready great schemes, necessarily involving a large expenditure of public money, for the purchase of land for soldiers who desire to earn a living in cultivation. There will be provision for ex-Service men for either

Small holdings,

Cottage sites and garden holdings,

Allotments on lease,

according to the choice which they make and the fitness which they show.

Provision has been made for building houses; money has been set aside for the provision of equipment, for the cultivation of the land, and credit will be provided on easy terms for the stocking of the land. Facilities will be provided to enable tenants to purchase their holdings. But the greatest benefit to the returned soldier and sailor is a policy that will effect a general improvement in the conditions of life throughout the country. . . .

INCREASED PRODUCTION.—You cannot have improved wages and improved conditions of labour all round unless you manage to increase production. . . .

There are gigantic arrears to make up in this country in every department of manufacture.

The same thing applies to our customers in other parts of the world. Europe will have as much as it can do to repair the devastation of war for years to come. There are new countries to be opened up, countries like Mesopotamia. In addition to that the Government have schemes for developing the resources of our own country in a way they have never been opened up before. All this will mean, when things begin going, the necessity for a greatly increased output. . . .

LABOUR AND CAPITAL.— . . . I say to Labour, you shall have justice; you shall have fair treatment, a fair share of the amenities of life, and your children shall have equal opportunities with the children of the rich. To capital I say: You shall not be plundered or penalised; do your duty by those who work for you, and the future is free for all the enterprise or audacity you can give us. But there must be an equal justice. Labour must have happiness in its heart. We'll put up with no sweating. Labour is to have its just reward. And when the whole nation sees that wealth lies in production, that production can be enormously increased, with higher wages and shorter hours, and when the classes feel confidence in each other, and trust each other, there will be abundance to requite the toil and to gladden the hearts of all. . . .

What Did They Say?

WHAT LABOUR SAID.

The Peace which Labour demands is a Peace of International Co-operation. The war aims of Labour must be the most powerful factor in the rebuilding of the world.

Freedom for Ireland and India it claims as democratic rights.

Land nationalisation is a vital necessity; the land is the people's, and must be developed so as to afford a high standard of life to a growing rural population not by subsidies or tariffs, but by scientific methods, and the freeing of the soil from landlordism and reaction.

At least a million new houses must be built at once at the State's expense, and let at fair rents. Labour will press for Public Education, free and open to all.

Labour is firm against Tariffs and for Free Trade.

In paying the War Debt, Labour will place the burden on the broadest backs by a special tax on capital. Those who have made fortunes out of the war must pay for the war.

Labour demands the immediate nationalisation and democratic control of vital public services such as mines, railways, shipping, armaments and electric power; the abolition of the menace of unemployment, the recognition of the universal right to work or maintenance, the legal limitation of hours of labour.

In politics the Labour Party stands for complete adult suffrage.

—(Extracts from *Labour Manifesto*, November, 1918.)

TRADE UNION RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. The prevention of unemployment and provision against unemployment should have been one of the first thoughts of the Government as soon as the question of industrial reorganisation began to be considered . . .

We are of the opinion that the unequal distribution of wealth, which prior to the war kept the purchasing power of the majority of the wage earners at a low level, constituted a primary cause of unemployment.

2. A complete and comprehensive scheme of unemployment provision, extending to all workers on a non-contributory basis, should be instituted at the earliest possible moment, and this scheme should provide for adequate maintenance pay to those workers who are under employed.

3. It is absolutely necessary to make provision for a greater degree of security on the part of the worker. The worker who is threatened with arbitrary dismissal should, in all cases, have a prior right of appeal to his fellow workers, and wherever dismissal takes place on grounds other than those of demonstrated misconduct, the worker who is dismissed should be entitled to a payment proportionate to his period of service with the firm.

4. Special provision should be made for the maintenance of widows with dependent children, and for the endowment of mothers, in order to prevent them from being forced into industry against the interest of society.

—(Extracts from *Recommendations made by the Trade Union side, Industrial Conference Provisional Joint Committee*, April, 1919.)

The Speakers' Handbook

COALITION ADOPTS LABOUR POLICY.

... There is a general feeling that some of the fundamental objects of the peace have not yet been achieved; the recovery of Europe has been delayed beyond expectation. ... The economic collapse of Central, Eastern, and South-Eastern Europe is now a most serious factor in the paralysis of European trade, and it cannot be remedied unless the produce and the markets of Russia are once more made available to the world. The presence of the real leaders of Russia is therefore necessary, in the opinion of the British Government, to the success of such a conference. No useful object is served by forwarding conditions in writing to Moscow. It is most important to deal, if possible, direct with the heads of the Russian Government, and a conference should be held as soon as possible at the most suitable centre for that purpose.

Joint Committee. April, 1910.

... It is essential that the rivalries generated by the emancipation of nations since the war should be averted from the paths of international hatred and turned to those of co-operation and goodwill.

—(Statement made by Mr. Lloyd George on behalf of the British Government to M. Briand at Cannes on January 4, 1921.)

CHURCHILL ON INDEMNITIES.—... It would, in my opinion, be for the benefit of the world if all international obligations arising out of the war were reconsidered, were reduced to practical dimensions, and placed in a category by themselves. But whether this be possible or not, what is immediately needed is a medium of international exchange.—Mr. CHURCHILL at Dundee, September 24th, 1921.

LABOUR ON INDEMNITIES.—... The Conference ... calls for concerted international arrangements for the stabilisation of the exchanges, the extension of credits, together with the promotion of commercial intercourse.

—(Trade Union and Labour Conference, Jan. 17, 1921.)

CHURCHILL ON REPARATIONS.—On the subject of reparation, Mr. Churchill said that he was delighted to see the steady, remorseless march of statesmen of all countries during the last few months towards financial sanity. Not only electioneering politicians but grave financiers and august members of the judiciary who had been speaking *nonsensical froth* about extracting twenty thousand millions from Germany, had reduced themselves to a much more practical statement of the case. He rejoiced to see that the simple fact that the payment from one country to another could only be made in the form of goods or service had once more become recognised by the most enlightened experts in different countries.—Mr. CHURCHILL's speech at the British Overseas Banks Association—"Understanding with Germany."

FINANCE.

The following figures show the increase and decrease in certain items of the State's actual income and expenditure. The Budget Estimates for 1922-23 will be found at the end of the Handbook, together with figures for 1921-22.

INCOME.		£	£
		1913-1914.	1920-1921.
Customs	35,450,000	...	134,003,000
Excise	39,590,000	...	199,782,000
Estate, etc., Duties	27,359,000	...	47,729,000
Property and Income Tax (including Super-Tax)	47,249,000	...	394,146,000
Excess Profits Duty, etc.	—	...	219,181,000
Corporation Profits Tax ..	—	...	650,000
Land Value Duties	715,000	...	20,000
Post Office	30,800,000	...	49,500,000

EXPENDITURE.			
Debt interest on—			
Old Debt	24,500,000	...	24,500,000
New (War) Debt	—	...	325,098,615
Payments to Local Taxation Accounts, etc.	9,734,127	...	10,785,593
Other Consolidated Fund Services	1,693,890	...	1,796,275
Supply Services :			
Army Services	28,331,000	...	181,500,000
Navy Services	48,833,000	...	88,428,000
Ordnance Factories...	15,000	...	—
Air Force Services...	—	...	22,300,000
Miscellaneous Civil Services	53,901,000	...	460,216,000
Customs and Excise...	2,431,000	...	4,610,000
Inland Revenue	2,052,000	...	6,649,000
Post Office Services...	24,607,000	...	53,678,000

THE DEBT.

How it has risen since December, 1918, under the Coalition.

	Total Debt.	Increase or Decrease during the year.
March 31, 1918 ...	5,871,850,637	...
March 31, 1919 ...	7,434,949,000	... +1,563,098,363
March 31, 1920 ...	7,831,744,000	... +396,795,000
March 31, 1921 ...	7,585,409,690	... -246,334,310
Dec. 31, 1921	7,748,000,000	... +162,590,310

The State's Income.

(1) **INDIRECT TAXES.**—The following tables show* the article taxed, the amount of the duty, and the yield to the revenue in 1920-1921 compared with 1913-1914.

Year	TEA. Duty	Yield £
1913-14	5d. a lb. ...	6,151,879
1920-21	10d. & 1/- a lb. ...	16,863,249

Year	SUGAR. Duty	Yield £
1913-14	1/10 a cwt. ...	3,051,786
1920-21	25/8 a cwt. ...	29,369,828

Year	COCOA. Duty	Yield £
1913-14	1d. a lb.
1920-21	4½d. a lb.

Year	COFFEE. Duty	Yield (Coffee & Cocoa) £
1913-14	14/- a cwt. ...	548,255
1920-21	35/- (Br.) cwt. to 42/- foreign ...	2,360,424

Year	BEER. Duty	Yield £
1913-14	7/9 per 36 galls ...	13,642,971
1918-19	25/- per 36 galls ...	25,423,393
1920-21	£5 per 36 galls ...	123,393,903

Year	TOBACCO. Duty	Yield £
1913-14	3/2 a lb. ...	17,254,125
1920-21	8/2—10/4½ a lb. ...	66,100,000

ENTERTAINMENTS.

Year	Yield £
1917	3,001,000
1920-21	11,735,840

If we group the indirect taxes as follows, and include the taxes on dried fruits and other drinks besides beer† the yield is:

	Food £	Drink £	Tobacco £
1913-14 ...	10,903,000 ...	43,268,000 ...	18,263,000
1920-21 ...	53,300,000 ...	209,870,000 ...	66,100,000

The meaning of these figures is better appreciated if expressed in terms of the burden of taxation on an average family of five persons:

	Amount paid in indirect taxes per week (1920-21)	
	s.	d.
Food	2	3
Tobacco	2	9
Drink	8	9
Entertainments	0	5½
	14	2½

Note.—If drink is taken to mean beer only, the figure should be 4s. 8d., and the total 10s. 1½d.

* Finance Accounts, 1914, 1921.

† "Taxation and Cost of Living," p. 24.

(2) **INCOME TAX.**—There are now 2,400,000 income taxpayers, whereas before the war there were less than 1,000,000. This does not imply that the incomes of 1,400,000 people have increased so as to bring them within the scope of the tax, but that the net has been spread wider to include the smaller incomes. In spite of the fact that the real value of money, in terms of goods and services, has been about halved the limit at which a person is exempt from income tax has been lowered from £160 to £150 earned (£135 unearned). Thus the small taxpayer is hit in two ways:

(1) By the lowering of the exemption limit.

(2) By the reduction in value through higher prices of the income he has.

There are people whose incomes have increased during the war, owing to the demand for armaments and other war material which they could supply, and who, having made money through the sale of goods at high prices, were able to invest it at the favourable war-time rates of interest. It is not necessary to write them all down profiteers, but national justice demands that those who benefited out of the nation's needs should pay for those benefits. The Labour Party considers that the exemption limit should be raised.

RELIEF OF FAMILY INCOMES.

The British income tax now recognises that ability to pay is not measured simply by the size of a man's income, but is less in the case of a family man than in the case of a single man with the same income. The relief given is, however, not sufficient.

The present allowances are as follows:

Marriage allowance	} £100 earned £90 unearned
Eldest child under 16 years	} £40 earned £36 unearned
Each younger child	} £30 earned £27 unearned

Thus the man with wife and three children has only an income of £350 exempt from payment of income tax.

The present allowances should be raised at least as follows:

Marriage allowance	} £150 earned £135 unearned
Each child under 16	} £60 earned £54 unearned

The result of these proposals would be that income tax would not be paid unless the income exceeds the sum mentioned by:

A single man or woman	} £200 earned £180 unearned
Married man without children	} £350 earned £315 unearned
Married man with one child	} £410 earned £369 unearned
Married man with two children	} £470 earned £423 unearned
Married man with three children	} £530 earned £477 unearned

(3) DEATH DUTIES.—Every year one-thirtieth of the wealth of the country changes hands by death. It goes chiefly into the hands of those who have done nothing to create it, and who, by means of its possession, are enabled to pile up and again to pass on further large fortunes. The inheritance of wealth is the most powerful factor making for inequalities of income, and the Labour Party, holding as it does, that the present great inequalities are morally and economically indefensible demands a drastic tightening up of death duties.

At present the State takes about one-tenth of the value of property passing at death (£48,000,000 1921 Estimate); which may be compared with the large sums derived from taxes on food, which, as already shown, fall most heavily on the poor. (Revenue from sugar tax above £29,000,000, from tobacco £55,000,000).

It is clear that a much larger deduction from inherited wealth might be made without seriously disturbing the motive for saving, or causing severe loss to those with legitimate expectations. Any such loss may indeed be compensated by the additional stimulus to individuals to work themselves, instead of relying on the efforts of others. With the growth of democratic feeling men increasingly demand that those capable of working should stand on their own legs, and not on their father's shoulders.

* INCOME AND TAXATION.

TABLE SHOWING PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL TAXATION TO INCOME.

Income.	Tax.		Tax.	
	1913-14.	1918-19.	1913-14.	1918-19.
£	£	£	£	£
50 ...	8.7 ...	— ...	8.7 ...	—
100 ...	6.0 ...	13.8 ...	6.0 ...	13.8
150 ...	4.9 ...	11.0 ...	4.9 ...	11.0
200 ...	4.8 ...	10.3 ...	7.0 ...	12.4
500 ...	5.8 ...	13.1 ...	9.9 ...	18.1
1,000 ...	6.6 ...	19.4 ...	12.2 ...	26.5
2,000 ...	5.8 ...	25.6 ...	12.0 ...	33.6
5,000 ...	6.8 ...	37.2 ...	12.4 ...	43.5
10,000 ...	8.1 ...	42.6 ...	15.1 ...	50.3
20,000 ...	8.3 ...	47.6 ...	16.0 ...	58.1
50,000 ...	8.4 ...	50.6 ...	18.1 ...	63.9

RICH AND POOR.—The following is an analysis of pre-war wealth, 1914:

Income		Number of Persons.	Aggregate Wealth.
Exceeding.	Not Exceeding.		
£	£		£
100 ...	500 ...	1,708,212 ...	336,000,000
500 ...	1,000 ...	521,708 ...	298,000,000
1,000 ...	10,000 ...	859,804 ...	2,143,000,000
10,000 ...	100,000 ...	180,532 ...	3,432,000,000
100,000 ...	1,000,000 ...	13,508 ...	2,027,000,000
Millionaires ...		484 ...	655,000,000

The meaning of these figures is best seen in the following statements:†

- 88 per cent. of the wealth of the country is owned by $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of population.
- 64 per cent. of the wealth of the country is owned by 2 per cent. of population.
- 24 per cent. of the wealth of the country is owned by 10 per cent. of population.
- 12 per cent. of the wealth of the country is owned by the remaining 40 millions of the population.

* Journal of Royal Statistical Society. March, 1919. Article by Rt. Hon. Herbert Samuel.

† Pethick Lawrence, "A Levy on Capital."

SUPER-TAX PAYERS.—The total wealth in the hands of private individuals has risen steadily. The following table* shows the increase in the number of super-tax payers, the total income assessable to super-tax and its yield:

Year of Assessment.	Estimated Total Income.	Estimated Yield of Super-tax.	Estimated number of persons chargeable.
£	£	£	
1912-13 ...	158,800,000 ...	2,995,000 ...	13,000
1913-14 ...	170,150,000 ...	3,210,000 ...	13,850
1914-15 ...	230,850,000 ...	10,900,000 ...	28,800
1915-16 ...	231,898,109 ...	19,621,262 ...	29,299
1916-17 ...	261,939,179 ...	21,697,019 ...	31,985
1917-18 ...	296,000,000 ...	25,500,000 ...	35,250
1918-19 ...	350,000,000 ...	40,000,000 ...	48,000
1919-20 ...	410,000,000 ...	46,000,000 ...	56,000
1920-21	55,000,000

Note.—The limit of exemption from super-tax was lowered in 1914-15 from £5,000 to £3,000, and in 1918 to £2,500.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOMES.—The following table shows approximately the number of people owning incomes of various sizes, with the aggregate amount of taxable income received by each class.

INCOME TAX AND SUPER-TAX.		YEAR 1918-19.*	
Income		No. of persons	Taxable income
£	£		£ millions
130—	160 ...	920,000 ...	373
100—	200 ...	915,000 ...	224
200—	250 ...	470,000 ...	120
250—	300 ...	285,000 ...	81
300—	400 ...	300,000 ...	102
400—	500 ...	165,000 ...	73
500—	600 ...	94,000 ...	51
600—	700 ...	65,400 ...	42
700—	800 ...	50,960 ...	38
800—	900 ...	38,700 ...	33
900—	1,000 ...	32,340 ...	30
1,000—	1,500 ...	85,000 ...	102
1,500—	2,000 ...	37,200 ...	64
2,000—	2,500 ...	24,200 ...	54
Total.		3,482,800	1,387
2,500—	5,000 ...	39,680 ...	136
5,000—	10,000 ...	15,330 ...	106
10,000—	15,000 ...	4,450 ...	54
15,000—	20,000 ...	1,750 ...	30
20,000—	25,000 ...	910 ...	20
25,000—	30,000 ...	595 ...	16
30,000—	40,000 ...	575 ...	19
40,000—	50,000 ...	320 ...	14
50,000—	75,000 ...	305 ...	18
75,000—	100,000 ...	135 ...	12
100,000 & over	...	150 ...	30
Total...2,500		64,200	455
Grand Total		3,547,000	1,842

Of the total taxable incomes of the country—roughly, £2,072 millions—£457 millions were owned by 64,200 persons, whilst the remaining £1,385 millions were divided among 3,482,800 persons.

From these tables it is clear that:

- (1) That as the size of the class of income gets larger the numbers possessing it get fewer.
- (2) That the large fortunes are owned by a very few persons.

* Cmd. 1084.

The Super-Wealthy.

Out of a total population of about 45 millions only 43,802 persons own fortunes large enough to be assessed for super-tax; but these wealthy persons between them own more than £333 millions.†

If we multiply this figure by five we have the number of persons supported by these fortunes, on the basis of five persons to a family, i.e., 219,010.

Note.—Owing to the method of assessing super-tax, the statistics available are always much in arrears. It is said that when the next report appears it will show a very large increase in the number of super-tax payers. The present figures do not include the years when the largest fortunes were made. The figures given do not always agree—the tables being based in some cases on estimates and in others on the latest information to hand. Sources are given.

INCOME TAXPAYERS.—Out of the total incomes which came under review of Income Tax Commissioners, 2,200,000 were relieved entirely from paying tax by the various reliefs and abatements.

3,482,800 were incomes between £130 and £2,500, which between them accounted for £1,384,717,796.

By far the largest number of incomes are below £500.

As regards the redistribution of wealth owing to the war, it seems probable that the net result is to leave things much as they were. The increased number of super-tax payers is partly accounted for by the lowering of the exemption limit, and must also be considered in relation to changes in population, but according to official forecasts there will probably be seen a large increase also owing to the large number of fortunes made in the later war years and the post-war trade boom. The mass of population, some 40 millions, is still below the income tax level.

LABOUR POLICY.

The Labour Party's policy* is taxation according to ability to pay, and the placing of the heaviest burden upon the broadest back. It therefore stands for no taxation upon necessities of life or upon incomes below a reasonable subsistence standard.

In particular, the Labour Party demands:

"A free breakfast table," i.e., the abolition of all existing taxes on food.

The reduction by fifty per cent. of the tax on tobacco.

Relief of the smaller income tax payers by increasing the minimum income free from tax.

Relief of small income tax payers with families by increasing the existing allowance for wives and children of the taxpayer.

Higher and more steeply graduated taxation of large incomes.

Higher and more steeply graduated death duties.

The rating and taxation of land values.

No protective tariffs, which fall on consumers and raise prices.

A "capital levy" or special tax on accumulated wealth in excess of £5,000, for the purpose of paying off the war debt.

* For general principles of taxation and ability to pay see "Taxation and the Cost of Living" (published by Parliamentary Committee of Trades Union Congress, 31, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1, price 1s.) and Labour Party pamphlet on "Taxation" by J. A. Hobson (price 1d., 6d. per dozen, carriage free).

† Cmd 1083.

Indirect Taxation and Cost of Living.

If we went back to the same total taxation (direct and indirect) that we had in 1913, we should find the family with an earned income of £50 a year paying a larger proportion of income in taxation than the same sized family with an earned income of £50,000.

And even in 1918-19 the family with earned income of £100 a year paid a larger proportion in taxation than did the family with £500 a year, while the unearned income of £100 paid a larger proportion than that of £200.

The strong regressive tendency of indirect taxation considered alone is corrected when the whole system of taxation is taken into account, but it is important to notice that this was not the case before the war, and is only due to the largely increased income tax and the lowering of the super-tax level.

If the Labour Party policy were carried out, and food taxes abolished, together with the entertainments tax (which only brings in about 1 per cent. of the revenue), and the tobacco duty reduced by half, the loss in revenue to the State would amount to something like £97,350,000.† But the relief to the average family of five persons would amount to about 4s. 6d. a week. This would not release the working class from all contributions towards the expenses of the State, for the average family would still pay taxes on drink and tobacco.

In view of the high cost of living and the persistent campaign to reduce wages, it should be noticed that this policy would reduce the cost of living by 15 points, according to official estimates.

FREE BREAKFAST TABLE.—An old Liberal promise was to take off the breakfast table duties, but so far from their having been abolished they have been largely increased. The Labour Party demands their abolition.

Indirect taxation consists mainly of taxes on food (sugar, tea, cocoa, coffee, dried fruits); drink (beer, wine, spirits, table waters); and on tobacco and snuff. Besides these there are the entertainments tax and taxes on clocks, watches, and a few other articles. But the bulk of the revenue from indirect taxation comes from taxes on food, drink, and tobacco.

Before the war (1913-14) the indirect taxation paid by a family of five persons, with an income of £100 per annum, amounted to 6 per cent. of their income. In 1918-19 the percentage of income paid by the same family in indirect taxation has gone up to 13.8. It would probably be rather higher at the present time, because restrictions on the amount available for consumption have since been removed. The percentage of indirect taxation gets steadily less as income increases, so that families of five persons with incomes of £50,000 paid in 1913-14 0.08 per cent, and in 1918-19 only .1 per cent.

The new Budget proposals for 1922-23 involve decreases in many of the food taxes. The reduction on tea is from 1s. to 8d. per lb on foreign tea, and from 10d. to 6½d. on Empire tea. Ninety per cent. of our tea comes from within the Empire.

TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL TAXES.—The case for taxing tobacco and alcohol is obviously stronger than for taxing the necessities of life. But tobacco has come to take the place of, at any rate, a conventional necessity to many. The present rate is very high, compared with the pre-war rate, and the Labour Party recommends its reduction by one-half.

* See Journal of Royal Statistical Society, March, 1919. Article by Rt. Hon. H. Samuel.

† "Taxation and Cost of Living."

The Speakers' Handbook

ENTERTAINMENTS TAX.—The entertainments tax may have been necessary during the war, but as a tax for normal times it is indefensible, for it is little better than the bad old "tax on knowledge." Drama, music, and even the cinema are agencies which the State should encourage. That it acts as a deterrent to many people from attending entertainments is clear from the agitation against the tax raised by proprietors of theatres and other places of amusement. Its yield is some £11,000,000 (1921), which is about 1 per cent. of the total national revenue, an amount which is not worth its cost in sacrifice to those whose lives and surroundings are as drab and monotonous as man can well make them.

INCOME TAX.—Although both the Coalition and the Labour Party would like to reduce income tax, the methods taken by each Party are very different, and have very different results.

According to the new Budget proposals for 1922-23 the Coalition intends that the standard rate of 6s. is to be reduced to 5s., which, of course, relieves only those paying at the 6s. rate, that is, anyone who has more than £225 taxable income. This involves a corresponding reduction for those who pay at the 3s. rate, but they will be relieved only to the extent of 6d., whereas the richer classes are relieved to the extent of 1s. in the pound. The new income tax will involve that a person who has an earned income of £250 a year and last year, therefore, paid £13 10s., this year will pay £11 5s., and the relief is £2 5s. But a person with an earned income of £5,000 paying £1,728 5s. last year, this year will pay £1,500 12s. 6d., and the relief is £227 12s. 6d. A person with a total income of £1,000, who, therefore, does not pay super-tax, is to be relieved this year to the extent of £32 12s. 6d. if his income is all earned, and to the extent of £37 12s. 6d. if his income is all "unearned." The relief grant is, therefore, obviously in favour of larger incomes. The more you have, the less you pay.

Some figures for married couples entitled to the allowance for the children may be given. If the income is £500, and the amount payable was £20 5s. last year, the amount this year will be £16 17s. 6d., and the relief granted is £3 7s. 6d. If the income is earned, and £4 7s. 6d. if it is unearned. If the income is £1,000 and the amount payable £141 15s. last year, this year it will be £118 2s. 6d.; the relief is £23 12s. 6d. for earned and £28 12s. 6d. for unearned income.

This gives the rich preferential treatment.

But the method of the Labour Party would be to leave the standard rate intact, increase the various allowances (see above), and, if necessary, put more on the super-taxpayers. By this means equal relief would be given to each group of income taxpayers with the same domestic responsibilities. E.g., all bachelors within each group liable to income tax would get off an equal amount. All married men within the same group would get off an equal but larger amount than the bachelor. All married men with one, two, or three children would get an equal, but still larger amount.

Higher and more steeply graduated taxation of large incomes should be introduced. The principle of graduation by which a larger proportion of income is taken from the higher than from the lower incomes is now generally recognised as just.

But the Labour Party believes its application could be carried further.

LABOUR AND THE RATES.

Is Labour extravagant? Has it been shown that if, Labour rules, the burden on taxpayers and ratepayers will be increased? Do the high rates in boroughs which have a Labour majority prove that Labour policy means increased burdens for the average citizen?

The expenditure of a local authority naturally increases if wages increase and the cost of commodities rises. Everyone now pays more for industrial services, for food and clothes and railway travel, than he did in 1914. It is not strange, then, that our local authorities, or rather *we* through our local authorities, should have to pay more for the services organised by them. The late Minister of Health said that 80 per cent. of the increase in local rates was due to charges over which the local authority had no control. The price of coal, the charges for producing gas and electricity have all increased, and none of these can be decreased by local authorities.

COST SIDE OF CAPITALIST SERVICES.—The amount of the excess, however, is important. The excess we have to pay on goods provided by capitalist companies is, in fact, *much larger* than the excess on municipal services. The cost of living excess in 1919 was 111 per cent. above the cost in 1914, but the percentage increase in the amount of local rate paid per head of population at the same date was only 13. That, however, was in 1919, when the activities of local authorities had not yet revived after the war. The increase in the expenditure of local authorities since 1919 has been largely due to the resumption of normal pre-war activities. Even so, the average increase in the rates in 1921 is only 103 per cent. above the 1914 level, while the increase in the cost of living is about 150 per cent. (See Ministry of Health Memo.—Cmd. 1016, price 2d.)

This official report says:

Nearly the whole of the increase, it is clear, has arisen in respect of the normal work of the local authorities, which has now been resumed. They, in common with other bodies and private individuals, find themselves in the position of having to pay larger sums of money than before the war for the pre-war quantity of service and commodities. And these larger sums of money having, when levied as local rates, to be levied on assessable values which for the most part remain (subject to a small addition) on a pre-war basis, are necessarily levied at an increased amount per pound of that valuation.

Most of the other causes contributing to bring about the increase in the amount of the local rates per pound of assessable values are subsidiary to these two main causes—the fall in the purchasing power of money and the smallness of the increase in the assessable values.

Expenditure is extravagant only when there is no need for it. Where need exists it is not extravagant to spend. Indeed, it may be more extravagant in the end not to spend money which would preserve health and efficiency. If you save too much on food, you will have to pay later for doctors and medicine. It is economical, in fact, to keep yourself fit. Now the need exists in all boroughs for good sanitation; but the need is greater in the boroughs where the poor live. The crowded parts of a city are those in which disease most easily spreads. In

boroughs where there are rich folk who send their children to expensive schools there is less need for expenditure by the local authority on education.

The amount actually spent by local authorities is shown as follows:

Year ending March 31st.	Total receipts by local authorities from		Average amount per head of assessable value of receipts from		Average amount per head of estimated population of receipts from		Assessable value of all rateable property at commencement of year.		Total expenditure by local authorities met from rates, grants, and all other sources except loans.	
	Rates.	Govt. Grants.	Rates.	Govt. Grants.	Rates.	Govt. Grants.	£	s.	£	s.
1904	52,911,665	15,616,015	£ s. d. 5 9 4	1 8 4	£ s. d. 1 11 10	9 5	182,802,591		100,500,000	
1913	68,212,608	21,958,241	6 6 4	2 1 1	1 17 6	12 1	209,068,688		140,337,532	
1919	84,500,000	28,920,000	7 8 4	2 7 1	2 5 1	15 5	219,649,623		194,360,000	

RECENT INCREASE IN RATES.—A later Report issued by the Ministry of Health (Cmd. 1155 of 1921, price 9d. net) gives the amount of local rates for 1913 and 1921 in most of the local government areas. The general conclusion is that the total amount of rates collected in 1913-14 was £71,276,000; but the total amount in 1919-20 was £103,700,000, and in 1920-21 it was £148,750,000. The percentage increase over 1913-14 was therefore 40 in 1919-20 and 98 in 1920-21.

The increase of rates is general, and is not to be found only nor chiefly in boroughs or areas where Labour has control. The increase has been very rapid within the last year, chiefly because that year was the first return to normal pre-war activities of local authorities, and because of the tendency for Parliament to pass Acts which involve additional expenditure by local authorities. Again, the need in poorer boroughs or districts is greater than in places where the rich reside; and this need has been greatly increased during the war.

It will, then, be understood that—

(1) The increase in the rates is due in the main to causes over which no local authority has any control;

(2) The recent increase is largely due to normal activities now resumed after the war period, and not to new adventures;

(3) The increase in some boroughs is due to their greater need and the lower assessable value of the property within their areas.

SOME LONDON FACTS.—Attacks are made, nevertheless, upon the Labour movement, on the ground that the rates are higher in the boroughs in which Labour has the majority on the Council. The defence put up by Mr. Herbert Morrison, of the London Labour Party, in the *London Labour Chronicle*, is probably known well enough already; but it may be useful to give some of the results.

First, it is clear that the rates are higher in some "Labour" boroughs or areas. There is no need to deny that. But it is not due to Labour control on the Councils. It would remain a fact, whatever party held control, that in districts where the poor live the rateable value of the property is low, and, therefore, the amount of the rate must be high in order to raise the same amount as can be raised in rich districts where the rateable value is high. Thus a penny rate in Bethnal Green produces £1,843; but a penny rate in Westminster produces £28,881. Therefore the poor district has to pay a 19s. 11d. rate, and the rich district a rate of only 11s. 1½d. That is not due to Labour control, but to the fact that the poor and the rich live in different districts.

OTHER BOROUGHS.—The rates for Buxton this year are 15s. 11d., and the population 16,229; but the rates for Chesterfield are 21s., and the population 39,774. Buxton gets £105,265 and Chesterfield £156,967, and the average amount of assessable value per head of population is £6 10s. for Buxton, and £3 19s. for Chesterfield. The municipal borough of Harrogate has rates at 15s. 6d., producing £278,480; but Batley has rates at 18s. 6d., which produce less, viz., £173,511. The average assessable value per head is £7 8s. in Harrogate and £4 15s. in Batley.

WHERE NEEDS ARE GREAT.—When we consider how the money is spent, the same sort of facts are seen to be important. Where the poor live the needs are greater, the population larger, and the amount to be done by a local authority is therefore greater. The actual amount spent in a poor district or borough may, therefore, be greater than the amount spent in a rich area. Thus the Metropolitan Borough of St. Pancras spent £228,339 for the half-year ending March 31, 1921, and Hampstead spent only £108,488; but the population of St. Pancras is 218,387, and that of Hampstead is only 85,495. Twice the expenditure was for the sake of two-and-a-half times the population; and yet the larger population was so poor that it had to pay 8s. 8d. in the £, while the richer, smaller population had to pay only 7s. in the £ for the half-year. In health services Canterbury pays only one farthing in the £ for the treatment of tuberculosis, but St. Helens (Lancs.) pays 2½d. Canterbury pays ¾d. in the £ for maternity and child welfare, and St. Helens 5½d. for the same services. (See full statement—Official Debates, House of Commons, March 16, 1921, column 1493).

The fundamental distinction is not whether Labour has control or not, but whether the district is where the poor or the rich live. Labour is not responsible for the present distribution of population. Capitalism is responsible for it.

TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

LABOUR POLICY.

The Labour Party holds that the whole value of land—that is whatever cannot be shown to be due to actual expenditure of money or labour by the owner or occupier—ought to be public revenue; but until this can be secured by public ownership, the Party favours a carefully devised scheme for the Rating and Taxation of the owners of Land Values, in relief of the occupiers, provided that adequate steps are taken to prevent the owner from securing for himself, either by raising the rent or the selling price of land, the benefits that are intended to accrue to the occupier or the community.—See pamphlet, "Labour and the Countryside."

BASIC PRINCIPLES.—This policy is based on the following principles:—

The land which Nature provided as the physical basis of life ought to be treated as common property.

When land is in private hands those who hold it should be called upon to pay to the people a rent or tax for it.

That this tax or rent should be based on the true market value of the land apart from the value of any improvements which may be in or upon it.

The tax should be made payable whether the land is being used or not.

VALUATION OF THE LAND.—For the purpose of instituting this Land Value Tax a complete re-valuation of all land should be made. The most important work has already been carried through by the Land Valuation Department, which was set up in compliance with the Finance Act, 1910. The valuations now in the hands of this department should be amended and brought up-to-date. For this purpose all valuations made should be subject to continuous revisions. The valuations ought to be made on behalf of the national authorities. This procedure would be necessary for a national tax, and it is also desirable for local rating purposes; it would secure the valuations being made by competent valuers free from local influences.

These valuations when completed ought to be available for public inspection in the respective localities in which the land valued is situated; this would facilitate the work of the local rating authorities, and at the same time expedite the execution of transfers.

CAPITAL VALUE THE BASIS.—The capital or selling value of the land should be taken as the basis for the land value valuations and for the land value tax. This principle has been adopted in New Zealand, Australia, and in those parts of South Africa where land valuations have been made.

Capital or selling value is of a more simple character than annual or letting value, as the amount of the latter is affected by the duration and other conditions of the lease.

CAPITAL VALUE OF LAND means that amount which the fee-simple of the land, irrespective of the improvements in or on it, might realise in the open market if sold at the time of valuation, subject to any public rights of way, use or easement, but free from any restriction or charge other than rates and taxes.

FREE FROM COMPLICATIONS.—The institution of a land value tax along the lines here indicated would be at once simple and direct. It is free from all the complications that lead to the breakdown of the so-called land taxes which the Liberal Government brought in under the headings of Increment Duty, Reversion Duty, and the Undeveloped Land Duty. During the famous People's Budget campaign of 1909, the sentiment for the direct taxation of land values was created, but, for reasons best known to the Liberals themselves, the direct policy of taxing the market value of all land, whether it is being used by the owner or not, was set aside in favour of the fanciful and unworkable duties mentioned above.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS.—The immediate effect of a direct tax upon the value of land would be the opening up of land for productive purposes. It would end the present system which allows a landowner to be assessed at £490 for land which has a value of £50,339 when it is required for building purposes (the Bellingham site purchased by the L.C.C.). Under Labour's land value tax scheme, the owners of land would be taxed according to the value of their land as entered in the valuation roll: this same valuation would be the basis of the purchase price. The pressure of the tax so levied would compel the owners of land either to use their land or to make it easy of access for those who would be willing to use it. In this way we would promote the development of the land, and, by virtue of the fact that more land had been brought into use, rents would be reduced. The effect of opening up greater opportunities to labour must be readily appreciated by those who are suffering from unemployment. Apart from these economic considerations, there is the just claim,

that as the land value is unquestionably the creation of the community as a whole, therefore the community have a moral right to appropriate through the machinery of taxation a part, or, if need be, the whole of the land value of the country.

TAX CANNOT BE PASSED ON.—A land tax cannot be passed on by the landowner to the tenant in the form of an increased rent, because the rent which the landowner can get for any particular land depends on the general competition for the land and on the amount of other land which is available. The present system enables landowners to force rents up by withholding land from use; the land tax would put an end to this practice and reduce rents generally. The effect of the landowner having to pay a land value tax would effect the distribution of the rent but not the amount of it. As John Stuart Mill said:—

A tax on rent falls wholly on the landlord. There are no means by which he can shift the burden upon any one else. It does not affect the value or price of agricultural produce, for this is determined by the cost of production in the most unfavourable circumstances.

... A tax on rent, therefore, has no effect other than its obvious one. It merely takes so much from the landlord and transfers it to the State ("Principles of Political Economy," V., iii., 2.)

The Speakers' Handbook

WHAT LLOYD GEORGE SAID.

The following extracts from the speeches of Mr. Lloyd George will be appropriate and will at the same time help to enforce the principles embodied in the foregoing policy:—

What Shall We Tax?—Year by year the value of that land and house passes out of the man that built it, who sweated for it, who raised money for it, into the hands of the man who never spent a penny in erecting that house. What do we say? We say the country has need of money, and we are looking out for someone to tax. We do not want to tax food; we will tax no man's raiment; we will not tax the house that shelters him and his family. What shall we tax? We do not want to tax industry. We do not want to tax enterprise; we do not want to tax commerce. What shall we tax? **We will tax the man who is getting something he never earned, that he never produced, and that by no law of justice and fairness ought ever to belong to him.**—*Mr. Lloyd George, at Carnarvon, December 8, 1909.*

Who ordained that a few should have the land of Britain as a perquisite; who made 10,000 people owners of the soil and the rest of us trespassers in the land of our birth; who is it? Who is responsible for the scheme of things whereby one man is engaged through life in grinding labour, to win a bare and precarious subsistence for himself . . . and another man who does not toil receives every hour of the day, every hour of the night whilst he slumbers, more than his poor neighbour receives in a whole year of toil? Where did the table of the law come from? Whose finger inscribed it? These are the questions that will be asked. The answers are charged with peril for the order of things the Peers represent.—*Mr. Lloyd George, at Newcastle, September 30, 1909.*

"Let's Burst It."—Search out every problem, look into these questions thoroughly, and the more thoroughly you look into them you will find that the land is at the root of most of them. Housing, wages, food, health, the development of a virile, independent, manly, Imperial race—you must have a free land system as an essential condition of these. To use a gardening phrase, our social and economic condition is root-bound by the feudal system. It has no room to develop, but its roots are breaking through. **Well, let's burst it.**—*Mr. Lloyd George, at Aberdeen, November 29, 1912.*

New Sources of Revenue Essential.—You cannot build houses without land; you cannot lay down trams for the purpose of spreading the population over a wider area without land. As long as the landlords are allowed to charge prohibitive prices for a bit of land, even waste land, without contributing anything to local resources, so long will this terrible congestion remain in our towns. That is the first great trust to deal with, and for another reason—the resources of local taxation are almost exhausted. It is essential that you should get some new resources for this purpose. What better resources can you get than this wealth created by the community, and how better can it be used than for the benefit of the community? Take the question of overcrowding. This land question in the towns bears upon that. **It is all very well to produce Housing of the Working Classes Bills. They will never be effective until you tackle the taxation of land values.**—*Mr. Lloyd George, at Newcastle, March 4, 1903.*

Taxation of Land Values

THE RATING OF LAND VALUES.—If the legislators of the past had intended to set up machinery which would ultimately check the progress and development of towns and boroughs, they could not have devised a better instrument for that purpose than our present rating system.

In levying rates the assessor takes as his basis for rating the "net annual value" of each property, land and improvements together. "Net annual value" is defined as "the rent at which the property—land and improvements—might reasonably be expected to let from year to year, free of all tenant's rates and taxes, tithe commutation rent charge, if any, and deducting therefrom the probable average cost of the repairs, insurance, and other expenses, if any, necessary to command such rent" (Parochial Assessment Act, 1836). It will be seen that this "net annual value" is arrived at by taking into account only what the property will yield in its present state irrespective of its market or selling value. The more a man builds and develops his property, the more he is penalised; and the less the use which he makes of it, the more he is favoured.

LLOYD GEORGE ON RATING.

The whole rating system is well summed up in the following parable by Mr. Lloyd George, when he said:—

The worst of the present system is that the moment a man neglects his property he escapes rates: the moment a man begins to improve his property he is fined as a ratepayer. A shopkeeper extends his premises. A great workshop is erected. The rate assessor comes down and says: "Information has been laid against you, sir, that you have extended your works, that you are providing more employment for hundreds of workmen. Are you guilty or not guilty?" He says: "I cannot deny it." Then he says: "I fine you £50 or £100 a year as long as you live, and don't do it again," and he goes on to a moorland near Leeds—not a building in sight, nor a plough on the land, no sign of one. Then he says: "This is all right, no improvements here," and he meets the proprietor and says: "What are you doing with this land?" The proprietor says: "I am holding it up until Leeds people want water; then I am going to charge them 800 years' purchase for disturbing my pheasants." The rate collector takes him by the hand and says: "It is such men as you who make the greatness of the country. We will only put you down 12s. an acre. We have got to put something down." He goes home feeling that he has done his duty. But somebody meets him in the street and says: "Have you heard that Mr. Brown has added a bathroom to his house?" He says: "I don't believe it. I will go there at once." He goes and says: "Is this true what I hear about you, that you have put on a new bathroom to your house?" He says: "I am sorry." Then he replies: "£2 added to your assessment, sir," and he walks home past a slum district and he says: "No baths here, anyway." He meets the proprietor and he just asks him the question. The proprietor re-assures him on the spot. He says: "No improvements about my property. Dilapidation and disrepair. They are not worth as much now as they were five years ago." He takes him by the hand and he says: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Go out and write quickly the assessment down by 15 per cent." *You think I am caricaturing. That is the rating system of England.*—*Mr. Lloyd George at Middlesbrough, November 8, 1913.*

HOUSING—LANDLORDS' EXACTIONS.

As an evidence as to how our present system of rating operates as a hostile tariff on industry, housing and general development, take the following instances in which land has been procured for housing purposes under the Government's Housing Scheme. Compare in each case the previous rateable value with the purchase price:—

Acquired by	Site and Area.	Purchase Price.	Annual Net Rateable Value.
		£	£
Acton U.D.C.	Acton Wells, 58.854 acres ...	33,000	110
Beckenham U.D.C.	Shortlands, 5 acres ...	1,829	(1)
Blackburn C.B.	Green Lane, 13.42 acres ...	2,280	30 5s.
Acquired by	Site and Area.	Purchase Price	Annual Net Rateable Value.
		£	£
Bolton C.B.	Firwood, 30.5 acres		
Bootle C.B.	Orrell No. 2 (with buildings), 28.6 acres ...	4,880	(2)
Cardiff C.B.	Green Farm, 204.536 acres ...	13,100	213
Cheadle R.D.C.	Tean Road, 4.25 acres	772	13 6s.
Chorleywood U.D.C.	Chorleywood Bottom, 4 acres ...	1,200	15
Darlington C.B.	Crosby and Thompson Streets, 2.843 acres	1,669	8
Dartford U.D.C.	Lowfield Street, 65.212 acres ...	9,292	86
Rotherham C.B.	Total Housing Sites, 138.75 acres ...	17,205	200
London C.C.	Becontree, 2,050 acres	295,544	3,590
London C.C.	Bellingham, 252 acres	50,339	490
London C.C.	Roehampton, 148 acres	120,000	951

THE PEOPLE PLUNDERED.

Altogether 3,006 acres are included in the above table. The aggregate price paid was £582,509, and the aggregate annual value on which the land had been rated was £6,053. If that rateable value represented the real annual value of the land, the selling price should not have exceeded twenty times as much, namely, £121,060. On the other hand, if £582,509 was really "the fair market value of the land," then a fair annual value for purposes of taxation should have been not £6,053, but £29,125.

UNEARNED INCREMENT.

That is not all. One has still to reckon with the tariff on houses, levied as soon as they are occupied. If these 3,006 acres are ever developed according to plan, there should be 36,072 houses at twelve to the acre. They will be rated at not less than £40 a year each.

Therefore, because houses are erected, the rateable value of an area of land is suddenly changed from £6,053 to £1,442,880.

(1) The 5 acres at Shortlands, Beckenham, were part of a larger subject of 40 acres rated at £42 15s. net. The reduction of this rateable value, owing to the severance, is under consideration. (By proportion, the rateable value of the 5 acres may meanwhile be taken to be £5 7s.)

(2) The 30.5 acres at Firwood, Bolton, formed part of a larger subject of 56.268 acres, rated at £71 net. The reduction of this rateable value, owing to the severance, is under consideration. (By proportion, the rateable value of the 30.5 acres may be taken to be £37 4s.)

BURDEN OF RATES.—Should further evidence be required to show the anti-social character of the present rating system, let us take the figures given in the official White Paper No. 119, 1913, on Urban Districts (Areas and Rates). Particulars given therein show how the burden of rates falls in 1,076 Urban Districts in England and Wales, having a population, in 1911, of 21,206,450. The totals for all these Urban Districts are as follows:—

Total area	...	3,884,139 acres
Area rated as "agricultural land"	...	2,533,035 acres
Rates paid on all land	...	£35,429,301
Rates paid on land as "agricultural land"	...	£400,689

Little more than a third (35 per cent.) of the land in urban districts in England and Wales is used for houses, gardens, shops, factories, etc. But this land with its improvements bears all the burden of local rates.

Practically two-thirds (65 per cent.) of the land in urban districts is rated as "agricultural land," though very valuable and urgently wanted for housing and industrial purposes. Being put to an inferior use, it is assessed at an insignificant amount, and contributes only 2½d. out of every £ collected in rates.

SCOTTISH RETURNS.

In the White Paper No. 144 of 1914 dealing with Scotland the returns show the same contrasts:—

Total area	...	157,881 acres
Area of "agricultural land"	...	58,833 acres
Rates collected in respect of:—		
Total area	...	£5,369,029
All "agricultural land"	...	£16,823

SOME URBAN EXAMPLES.

In order that the true significance of "agricultural land" may be fully appreciated, we will culled a few examples from these White Papers. (The amount of rates mentioned in each case were collected in 1911-12.)

Municipal borough or Urban district.	Total area (including agricultural land). Acres.	Area of agricultural land Acres.	Total amount of Rates collected (including agricultural land).	Amount contributed to the rates in respect of agricultural land.
Leeds	21,572	10,232	£896,622	£3,309
Manchester	21,645	5,300	1,759,046	1,611
Glasgow	12,975	2,170	1,730,086	347
London	74,816	8,102	15,869,181	2,594

Were a stranger from another land to review our rates books he would conclude that our cities must be very excellent farm centres!

LABOUR AND RATING.

The whole of our present rating system is fundamentally wrong, and has been the main cause which has brought about the deadlock in many municipal rating areas during the past year.

If we are to encourage housing and the better development of our cities, we must remove the rate burdens which now fall so heavily upon such undertakings. In order to attain this end, the Labour Party advocates the policy of rating land values. Such a policy, if adopted, would not only relieve housing and improvements, but would bring idle land in and around towns into use, and so mitigate the evils of congestion. An entire revision of the Rating Laws is essential, and full powers should be given to all Local Authorities to levy their rates, in whole or in part, upon the market or selling value of land within their respective areas.

The Speakers' Handbook

VALUATION FOR RATING PURPOSES.—For local rating, as for national taxation purposes, the valuations of land value, amended and brought up-to-date, in the hands of the Land Valuation Department, should, in the first instance, be taken as the basis for levying a land value rate. In subsequent revisions of the valuations, which may take place annually or quinquennially, local assessors could facilitate the work of such revisions and adjust the rate levied accordingly.

BASIS OF LAND VALUE RATE.—In ascertaining the land value of any property, buildings and other improvements do not enter into the calculation. The land value of any property is that price which the fee-simple of the land would realise in the open market, if sold (free of rates and taxes) as a vacant site or in its natural state by a willing seller. If such a basis were taken for the imposition of a rate or tax, the so-called "agricultural land" in and around growing towns would be rated equally with the surrounding land. Under these circumstances any attempt to withhold land from use in the hope of obtaining a "fancy price" would be a ruinous policy for the landowners.

EFFECT OF RATING LAND VALUES.—Relief from the burden of rates would be given to the users of houses, factories, farm buildings, and agricultural improvements, etc., by—

Checking speculation in land, and forcing valuable sites into use, rents would fall.

The natural means of production becoming more accessible to labour, employment would be stimulated.

The people as a whole, and not a few privileged persons, benefiting by the expenditure of the rates, and the general development of the land.

The housing problem would be greatly simplified, and the general health and well-being of the people would be improved.

RAPID REPAYMENT OF DEBT.

The Contribution of the Rich.

AMOUNT OF DEBT.—On December 31st, 1921, the national debt amounted to the huge total of £7,800 million pounds.

This is more than £160 a head for every man, woman and child in the British Isles, and more than £800 on the average for every family of father, mother and three children.

The method of dealing with this debt put forward by Mr. Lloyd George at the last general election was to make the Germans pay the bulk of it. This is now known to be incapable of realisation.

INDIRECT TAXES.—Instead the country is being taxed to pay interest and sinking fund. These two will together amount to £400 millions a year when interest on the debt owed to the United States is included. This sum is more than one-third the whole revenue of the State; and it is mainly in consequence of this that

the tea tax is now 10d. a lb. against 5d. in 1914.

the sugar tax is now 3d. a lb. against less than a farthing in 1914.

the beer tax is now 4½d. a pint against ½d. in 1914.

the tobacco is now 6d. an oz. against 2½d. an oz. in 1914.

and also that there are an entertainments tax, a 6s. in the £ income tax, corporation tax and doubled postage rates.

BONDHOLDERS GROW RICHER.—In his speech on November 9th, 1921, Sir Robert Horne, the Coalition Chancellor of the Exchequer said "high taxes are one of the causes of unemployment to-day," and further pointed out that a great debt increases the cost of production and so makes it more difficult for the British manufacturer to trade abroad.

The effective burden of the national debt grows heavier every year for as prices fall the same annual sum of money represents more things. Thus the tribute of luxuries obtained by wealthy bondholders represents a larger and larger part of the nation's production. For this reason the milk grant for poor mothers is to be cut down and the education of the people's children reduced.

LABOUR POLICY.

The policy of the Labour Party is to wipe out once and for all the whole or a great part of the debt by a levy on all accumulated wealth. The Joint Committee of the Parliamentary Committee and Trades Union Congress in their Second Interim Report on Taxation and the Cost of Living laid principal stress on this proposal. On page 45 they say:

Whilst not receding from our considered opinion that the repayment of the whole of the National Debt is practicable and desirable in the national interest, we propose as a practical measure, which should meet with wide support, that the levy should be devised to raise at least £4,000 millions.

The Speakers' Handbook

THE EXEMPTION LIMIT.

The Labour proposals provide for an *exemption limit* below which a fortune would not be subject to the levy. The Joint Committee suggest that this should be fixed at £5,000. Any man or woman whose total wealth was below this sum (whether it included war bonds, war certificates, etc., or not) would pay *nothing*.

Above the exemption limit the levy would be *graduated* according to the size of a man's fortune. The joint committee suggest that a man with £6,000 should pay only one per cent. on the excess of his fortune above £5,000; thus, he would pay one per cent. on £1,000, i.e., only £10 altogether. Larger fortunes would pay more, and a millionaire might have to pay as much as 50 per cent.

PAYMENT IN SECURITIES.

A special feature of the levy would be that the taxpayer would have the option of handing over *securities* instead of money to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Thus, the levy would not cause the forced realisation of stocks and shares which opponents allege. It would not reduce the real capital of the country, but alter its ownership.

Men with all their money locked up in their own business would be allowed to pay in instalments.

A levy of £4,000,000,000 would reduce national expenditure by over £200,000,000 a year. As a result it would be possible to give relief to taxpayers in many ways.

YIELD OF TAXES.

The yield of some of the principal taxes at present is as follows:—

Taxes on food	50 million	£
" " tobacco	66	" "
" " entertainment	12	" "
Corporation Tax	30	" "
Income and Super-Tax	400	" "

It would be possible, therefore, to abolish the taxes on food, cut off half the tax on tobacco, get rid of the Corporation and Entertainments Taxes, knock fifty million pounds off the income tax, and still have thirty million pounds over to provide education and other reforms.

ECONOMISTS AND CAPITAL LEVY.

To a working-class family of five persons, this would mean a saving of 4s. a week. Also most professional men, shopkeepers, small business men and many others would gain by the levy, and only those with large incomes derived from great investments would find themselves worse off.

The levy on capital has the support of Mr. Maynard Keynes, the author of "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," and of the majority of other leading economists. It is already in force in four countries in Europe—Italy, Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia, and has recently been adopted in Poland.

The levy will free Britain from the bulk of its debt and enable production to be for the people as a whole instead of for the luxuries of the wealthy bondholders.

ARMAMENTS.

Our Colossal War Bills.

We have to pay our bills every year for past and future wars. The amount of the bills paid last year (1920-21) has been published in the Finance Accounts (H.C. 146, Oct. 1921, price 9d. net.) The amount *paid in the past year alone* will give some idea of the burden of war. The figures do not show:

- (1) The loss of capital wealth in wars before 1914;
- (2) The expenses of preparing for and current payments made during these wars;
- (3) The loss of productivity during and after the "great" war;
- (4) The expenses already paid between 1914 and 1920 for the "great" war.

Many other items should be added to make a complete account of the liabilities for wars; but this is enough to indicate how expensive war has become. It may be argued that war is a method of securing peace; but if so, we may find that it is so costly a method that we cannot afford it and must therefore think out another method.

As for the assets—we ought to be able to show on that side of the account what we have paid for. What precisely is it? *VICTORY?* It would be difficult to decide whether this was an asset or a liability; but the economic value of unemployment, lack of housing, loss of trade, etc., is what we have gained at the following expense during 1920-21:—

FOR WARS BEFORE 1914.

Annual interest paid in year ending March 31, 1921.

National Debt for past war. Permanent annual charge:

	£	£
Funded Debt Interest	...	7,879,840
Terminable Annuities	...	2,588,562
Unfunded Debt Interest	...	5,949,154
Management of the Debt	...	741,987
New Sinking Fund	...	7,340,455
		<hr/> 24,500,000

Incidentals: Pensions for descendants of admirals and generals ... 16,360

FOR THE LAST WAR.

War Debts. Outside permanent charge:

	£
Interest on War Debt	...
American Loan	...
Other Debt under War Loan	...
Acts	...
Sinking Funds	...
Deficiency in amount available for securities surrendered for death duties	...
Expenses of Administration	...
	<hr/> 325,098,114

TOTAL INTEREST ON ALL WAR DEBTS ... £349,598,114

REDEMPTION OF DEBT.

	£
War Loan Bonds, etc., paid off ...	76,291,636
Savings Certificates paid off ...	30,400,000
Exchequer Bonds paid off ...	28,212,643
American Loan 1915 paid off ...	59,229,220
	£288,020,521

In addition the amount allowed for a depreciation fund under the Finance Act of 1917 should be counted as a war expenditure. This was: £31,920,267.

WAR INCIDENTALS.

For the Great War.

	£
1. Ministry of Pensions ...	109,255,662
2. Ministry of Munitions ...	16,859,944
3. Ministry of Food ...	2,134,522
4. Bread Subsidy ...	42,460,166
5. Nat. Saving Committee ...	105,000
6. Treasury Securities Scheme ...	1,559,485
7. War Graves Commission ...	1,486,130
8. Liquor Control Board ...	256,552
9. Loans to Dominions and Allies ...	24,058,771
10. Railway Agreements ...	38,253,427
11. Canal Compensation ...	992,362
12. Miscellaneous War Services:	
Foreign Office ...	3,206,158
Coal Mines Deficiency ...	12,929,201
14. Coastwise Transport Subsidy ...	364,973
15. Export Credits ...	1,913,984
16. War Bonus ...	10,123,747
	£265,960,090

For Future Wars.

Army Services ...	181,500,000
Navy Services ...	88,428,000
Air Force Services ...	22,300,000
	£292,228,000

It is worth noting that the incidental expenses of the last war are not all included above. For example, some part of the money spent on unemployment relief is a cost of the war, but how much it is difficult to say. Again the amount raised by rates and spent by local authorities has increased because of the war and should therefore be added to our war expenses; and there are many other instances of increased expenditure due to the war.

With regard to incidental expenses it will be noted that many are for industrial services performed by the State. It seems likely that all modern war must be industrial and that in our modern industrial nations any war must result in adjustments, reorganisations and additions to our industrial system, which are all very expensive.

The incidentals will not have to be paid every year. Such charges as the bread subsidy have ceased, others such as export credits will cease. Even pensions will gradually decrease as this generation dies: but for many years yet there will be a large amount to be paid, in addition to interest on the debt, as incidentals in the expenses in the great war.

For future wars also the full account cannot be given. What we actually pay is much more than the £290,000,000 for the armed forces. If, for example, we could do away with the need for preparing war we should not have to pay for some of our Foreign Services, now paid under the Foreign Office vote.

Armaments

Last Year's War Bill.

The full amount therefore paid last year for war was:—

	£
Debt Interest ...	349,598,114
Debt Redemption ...	231,555,888
War Incidentals ...	265,960,090
Future Wars ...	292,228,000
Total ...	1,139,342,092

The whole amount of the State income last year was ...	£ 1,376,483,763
Out of which for war we paid ...	1,139,342,092
Leaving for peace services ...	237,141,170

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

The immense amount paid for war goes into somebody's pocket. For future wars, apart from men in the fighting services, a large amount goes to armament firms. For example, the Admiralty have placed contracts for new ships with the armament firms, and the result is that the shares in these firms immediately become more valuable and the annual income of the shareholders increases.

For past wars, apart again from payment in pensions (incidentals), the payments in interest to holders of War Loan go to the richer classes. Of the £7,500,000,000 held in State securities, only £566,849,000 is held by "small investors"; and, of course, even these small investors do not include the majority or even a large minority of wage-earners.

One-fifth of the interest annually paid on debt goes to the workers and fourteen-fifths to the property owners.

Again, the hard times of 1920 have decreased the holdings of "small investors." Their savings invested in War Loan in 1918 amounted to £179,000,000, but in 1920 to only £22,000,000. That is to say, as the years pass, more and more of the interest goes into the pockets of the rich.

For non-war services, on the contrary, the payments go in salaries to civil servants, to judges, etc., as if they were pensions or payments for services performed. There is hardly any non-war payment of State money which goes to shareholders in companies, or to large owners of property. That is one reason why war is said to bolster up the capitalist system and peace tends to decrease its evils. The burden of war is almost entirely on the heads of the poor: such gain as there is in it is almost entirely for the rich, in spite of the very transitory gain of high nominal wages while war actually goes on.

FUTURE WARS.

In spite of all the money and lives spent on past wars, our preparation for future wars continues to grow.

	1913-14.	1920-21.
Army ...	£28,466,483	£181,500,000
Navy ...	49,041,909	88,428,000
Air Force ...		22,300,000
	£77,508,392	£292,228,000

Reasons for Present Cost:—

1. Increased territory. About 800,000 square miles added to the British Empire by Peace Treaties.
2. Military policy within the Empire, e.g., Ireland in 1920-21; Egypt; Mesopotamia; India.
3. Coalition delay in making peace, e.g., in Turkey and Russia.

The Speakers' Handbook

Notes on Changes:

1. The Air Forces were included under the Army cost of 1913-14.
2. Increase in number of officers and higher commands. In 1914 we had 519 officers on the staffs of commands; in 1921 we have 1,421. The Army is only twice as large as in 1914.
3. We had 77 submarines in 1914, and in 1921 we have 150 and 20 more building.

COST OF PEACE SERVICES.

We may now turn to the non-war services of the State. These include all our payments of public money for law and justice, for education and social welfare and for the upkeep of the fabric of government. Some of these payments are partly due to war: for example, if war were not so frequent, we might be able to pay less for our foreign services and, at any rate, we could save £200,000 a year which we now pay for "secret service" abroad. This is almost entirely due to the competition in military decits. However, in order to make the case as fair as possible for war activities we shall not attempt to subtract from the cost of peace services these small amounts. It should be remembered that it is from these payments for peace that reactionaries desire to subtract a part in the name of anti-waste. We pay from State funds about £59,000,000 for education, science and art, that is to say, the cost of about seven battleships. The cost of three new battleships would provide half as much again for our education if we saved on battleships and spent on education. And the point to be noted is that peace expenditure *increases* the capacity of the nation to spend. It is productive expenditure. Law and government, education and pensions and maintenance all promote the advance of industry and commerce and raise the general standard of civilisation.

Comparisons:—

(a) War cost (1920-21)	£ 1,139,342,092
Non-war State Services	237,141,170
(b) Non-war Services include:—	
For "Whitehall" (about)	18,392,843
For Education, Science, etc.	59,331,426
For Post Office	4,178,000
For the Consolidated Fund Civil List, etc.	1,796,275

(c) The proportions of the Central Government expenditure are as follows:—

On War:—

Debt Interest	25.4
Debt Redemption	16.9
War Incidentals	19.3
Future Wars	21.2

TOTAL FOR WAR 82.8

On Peace:—

Education	4.3
Law and Justice	1.4
Old Age Pensions, Unemployment, Health, etc.	5.2
"Whitehall"	1.3
Other Services	5.0

TOTAL FOR PEACE 17.2

Armaments.

EXPENDITURE OF THE STATE.

ON OLD WARS:—

Million pounds.	Of every 20s.
To those who fought and the dependents of those who died	
—pensions	1s. 7d.
To those who lent their money	
—interest on their money	5s. 1d.
—repayment of their money	3s. 4d.
War Incidentals	
—"winding-up," etc.	2s. 3d.

ON ARMED PEACE AND NEW WARS:—

292 The Armed Forces	4s. 3d.
	= 16s. 6d.

ON PEACE:—

59 The Education of the People	10d.
22 The Health and Housing of the People	4d.
25 The Unemployed ex-Serviceman and worker, etc.	4½d.
26 The Aged	4½d.
107 Other Peace Services	1s. 7d.
	= 3s. 6d.

£1,377 millions

FOR WAR	16s. 6d.
FOR PEACE	3s. 6d.

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES.

When you buy 1 lb. of tea, you

pay about 6d. to the Government—about 4½d. is for WAR.

On 7 lbs. of sugar, the tax

is 1s. 7½d.; 1s. 3½d. is for the COST OF WAR.

The Governments gets 6½d.

from every quart of beer; 5½d. is for the COST OF WAR.

Buy an ounce of tobacco, and

you pay a tax of 5½d.; 4½d. is for the COST OF WAR.

On a packet of 20 cigarettes,

the tax is nearly 7d.; 6d. is for the COST OF WAR.

Go to the cinema, theatre, or a

football match, pay 1s. 3d.,

3d. is tax; 2½d. is for the COST OF WAR.

THE COALITION IS RESPONSIBLE.—Its military policy in Russia, Ireland, Mesopotamia and Egypt has cost money. It should not be allowed to excuse itself by saying that it has changed its policy *after the money is spent*. Every prodigal goes anti-waste in time.

The Coalition has cramped the League of Nations. The British Government refused to give information to the League of Nations as to its military preparations, although it was pledged to give this information. The Coalition has never taken the League of Nations seriously.

The Speakers' Handbook

LABOUR POLICY.

Resolutions :

1. Against War and Imperialism. (Brighton Conference, June, 1921).

"This Conference condemns the policies of imperialism and militarism which are being pursued by the British Government and by its Allies."

2. League of Nations.

"Of all the conditions of Peace none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more War."

"The League of Nations, in order to prepare for the concerted abolition of compulsory military service in all countries, must first take steps for the prohibition of fresh armaments on land and sea, and for the common limitation of the existing armaments by which all the peoples are already overburdened; as well as the control of war manufactures and the enforcement of such agreements as may be agreed to thereupon. The State must undertake such manufactures themselves, so as entirely to abolish profit-making armaments firms, whose pecuniary interest lies always in the war scares and progressive competition in the preparation for war."

War Aims Memorandum, agreed February 20th, 1918, between the Labour Party and representatives of Labour from France, Belgium, the United States, Canada, Australia, etc.

This is a statement made by Labour during the war, and nearly four years before the Washington Conference.

ARMAMENTS DEPEND UPON POLICY.—Official Statement (Cmd. 1191) of First Lord of Admiralty, explaining Navy Estimates for 1921-22: "Estimates can only be based upon policy." And what is Coalition Policy? It is *force* and the threat of force. We need a large army because the Coalition has increased hostility to British rule in India and Egypt. The Coalition tried force in Mesopotamia and Ireland and *spent the money on force*; and when force failed, the Coalition tried another plan. But its *failure* should not be forgotten. We need a large navy because the Coalition will not take the League of Nations seriously and still pursues the Balance of Power.

THE WASHINGTON CONFERENCE.

The Limitation of Armaments.

ARMAMENTS AND POLICY.—The Conference of Far Eastern Powers, which met on Armistice Day in Washington, was summoned by the American Government to deal with disarmament and the problems of the Far East. Mr. Hughes, the American Secretary of State, opened it with a bold stroke, actually outlining in public session the exact reductions which he proposed in the naval armament of the chief Powers. This had the result desired. It focussed attention, and keyed up expectation on the question of disarmament at sea. But it relegated disarmament on land to the background, and it was, therefore, easier for M. Briand in due course to put his absolute veto on any discussion of this subject.

The other grave defect of Mr. Hughes's strategy was that it inverted the maxim that *armaments depend on policy*. The reduction of fleets was treated as an isolated issue apart from the economic Imperialism of the Powers in China, which is in the Far East the obvious cause of armaments.

CAPITAL SHIPS.—Mr. Hughes, however, certainly meant business. He took the fleets of the chief Powers as they stood at the armistice, calculated the ratio between them, and proposed to make it permanent. A heavy proportionate reduction was to be carried out at once. A "holiday" for all new building was to be declared for ten years. Thereafter capital ships might be replaced on attaining the age of 20 years.

The ratio proposed, and eventually adopted, was Great Britain, 5; America, 5; Japan, 3; France, 1.75; Italy, 1.75.

There were to be scrapped by the three leading Powers 64 capital ships, or a total of 1,878,000 tons. Our own "sacrifice" was to be 15 of our older ships, and the abandonment of the four Hoods just laid down. America offered to scrap no less than 15 capital ships in course of construction.

POST-JUTLAND WARSHIPS.

The first serious difficulty was raised by Japan. She was asked to scrap the Mutsu, the world's biggest battleship, which she had just completed. She refused, with the result that the whole programme had to be modified. We are to continue building two of the four Hoods, and America may also complete two of her post-Jutland monsters. This greatly reduces the gains to economy, for each of these new ships costs about £10,000,000.

The next difficulty was made by France. She demanded permission to build no less than 10 new post-Jutland warships, which would have given her the most powerful modern fleet in Europe. It seemed a singular use to make of her tribute from Germany. This demand was dropped only after the American Government had addressed a very stiff written remonstrance to M. Briand, which was published. On this he gave way, but France and Italy are each entitled to build two new capital ships during the "holiday," which has been seriously infringed all round.

Guns upon capital ships are "limited" to 16in. (which is, in fact, the maximum that can be safely discharged) and their tonnage is not to exceed 35,000.

PERMITTED TONNAGE.

The total tonnage of capital ships is rationed as follows: Great Britain and America, 525,000 each; Japan, 315,000 France and Italy, 175,000 each.

THE NEW ARM.—*Aircraft.*—The new developing arm at sea, perhaps eventually the decisive arm, is however aircraft. The Conference decided that no limitation is practicable here. Aircraft carriers may be of 27,000 tons, and may carry 8in. guns. For these the tonnage allowance is for America and Britain 135,000 tons, for Japan 81,000 tons, and for France and Italy 60,000 tons.

One very singular feature of the treaty is that it may lapse in war-time. Should war break out among these Powers (and there are no other naval Powers worth mentioning) they may suspend their treaty obligations and indulge in unlimited building.

Submarines.—The hottest debate raged over submarines. The British Government proposed to abolish the submarine altogether, but received no support. Our delegates argued that it is useless for legitimate warfare, whether offensive or defensive, and of value only for commerce destruction. France resisted any limitation. The French even asked for permission to build no less than 90,000 tons of submarines, and, as they stubbornly refused to lower the figure, this arm was, like aircraft, left unregulated.

Something, however, was done to satisfy sentiment. The Conference agreed that submarines cannot act humanely against merchant vessels, and accordingly prohibited their use as commerce destroyers. There may be some loopholes in this prohibition; it is even possible that the declaration of a blockade might legalise their use. In any event, it is obvious that no Power really relies on the force of this prohibition. We nationally claim the right to build an unlimited number of anti-submarine craft, and also to arm merchantmen. France is, geographically, in a position to damage us far more severely by the use of submarines than ever Germany was, since she holds one shore of the Channel, may count on Belgium as an ally, and has in the Mediterranean and on her African coasts innumerable bases which would command our chief trade routes.

Poison Gas.—The use of poison gas in any form was totally prohibited. Here again one may safely say that no one trusts the prohibition. "The only way," as Lord Grey said, "to abolish poison gas is to abolish war."

THE PACIFIC PACT.—The gain from the Conference for economy will be only moderate. The advantage to humanity is doubtful. The real gain is that it has ended, to all appearances, the possibility of competition in building between Britain and America, which might have resulted as the Anglo-German rivalry did—in open struggle. Public opinion accepted the renunciation of Britannia's supremacy at sea with remarkable calm, and a sorrowful cartoon in "Punch" was almost the only protest.

The political consequence of this concrete affirmation of Anglo-American friendliness was the formal termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance.

That is a great gain, but one recalls the curious fact that the renewal of the alliance was prevented only by the opposition of Canada at the Dominion Conference last summer. As usual the Coalition stumbled into sense, and claims virtue only by the reversal of its own errors. Japan,

meanwhile, has found an even more congenial associate in France. They supported each other throughout the Conference, and find common ground in their aggressive policy towards Russia.

As a sort of substitute for the alliance, all four Powers—America, Britain, France and Japan—have joined in the so-called "Pacific Pact," by which they "agree to respect their rights" in their insular possessions in the Pacific (which include the Dominions), to meet in conference to settle disputes, and to discuss appropriate measures should these rights be threatened by any other Power.

It is hard to say exactly how much this creation of a Pacific Concert means. Serious disputes over the islands are improbable. If the concert functions at all, one fears that it will be as a *secret conclave of the exploiting Powers for the regulation of Chinese affairs.*

In regard to the islands, however, a highly important decision was taken. America agrees not to fortify the Philippines and Guam. As this leaves her without a defensible naval base in the Western Pacific, it confirms the naval supremacy of Japan in Chinese waters. The lack of a base balances the superiority of the American over the Japanese fleet in tonnage.

CHINESE AFFAIRS.—The Conference has adopted a number of pious platitudes about China. It has, of course, recognised her independence and integrity, which is the customary Imperialist grace before meat. A few minor boons may be noted. We are to quit Wei-hai-wei, but we refuse to give up Kowloon, and, of course, Hong Kong. Foreign post offices will disappear, and China may raise her customs from 3½ to 5 per cent. But, so far, all efforts have failed to dislodge Japan from the Shantung railway, the strategical backbone of her possession of that province. She refused even to discuss her occupation of Manchuria, or the 21 demands which imposed a veiled Japanese protectorate over the whole of China. So far the Franco-Japanese combination has effectually defeated all attempts to get a discussion of the scandal of the Japanese occupation of Vladivostok and the Russian Far Eastern Republic. *The general subject of capitalist penetration in China, by banks, railways and mines has been totally ignored.*

In short, the Powers have tried to limit armaments without limiting Imperialism. On the whole, they have failed. They have not touched armaments on land, or in the air, or under the water. All they have achieved is some limitation of capital ships.

Perhaps the chief insincerity of the Conference regarded as a naval parliament, is that it failed to raise the immense question of the right to blockade. Our unlimited claim to organise hunger for our own national end stands unchallenged. Is it because America, which now shares with us the supremacy of the seas, has lost her interest in their freedom?

"Doomed to Failure."

Drawn up on the pretence of assisting a few essential industries of the country, rushed through Parliament by means of the gag and the guillotine, ignoring the views of the trades and industries it affects, the Act* is doomed to failure, unless it is greatly modified or repealed without delay irreparable harm will be done to our already scant export trade.—Mr. O. F. C. BROMFIELD, *Secretary of the British Chemical Trade Association.*

* Safeguarding of Industries Act.

WORKING OF DYE STUFFS ACT.—The following letter was sent to the *Westminster Gazette*:—

It is already known that considerable quantities of goods for export, normally dyed here, have been sent abroad for dyeing, because the British dyer has been unable to guarantee certain important conditions insisted upon by export buyers, such as fastness to light, etc., because the dyes he has been forced to use have fallen short of the required standard. As already shown, the new scheme under which licences are to be issued will, in all probability, further reduce the possibility of securing satisfactory dye-stuffs for special orders, and it is safe to predict that still further business will be lost to this country. A further effect will soon follow. Economy of production will require that the cotton goods, etc., must be produced where the dyeing is done. Lancashire and Yorkshire will fully appreciate this menace.—Yours,

RAAB & GREEN, 29 and 30 Cook Lane, E.C.1
January 11th.

COALITION STATEMENTS.

Mond's Two Voices.

Do not let the vested interests get their snouts into your dinner pail. Do not let them feel how easy it is to become wealthy without effort, without capital, and without industry at the expense of the poor people in this country. Every man benefiting from a tariff is a robber.—SIR ALFRED MOND, in the *Queen's Hall*, April 7th, 1911.

Of course, it (the Safeguarding of Industries Act) will raise prices. That is the object of it. If it did not do that there would be no point in it.—SIR ALFRED MOND, in the *House of Commons*, May 31st, 1921.

A Broken Pledge.—Speaking in the House of Commons on September 29, 1915, Mr. Bonar Law, referring to the McKenna duties on motor cars, etc., said: "Duties of this kind will never be continued under any circumstances when the war is over."

On the strength of this pledge the Free Trade Majority in the House passed the duties as a war measure. They are not yet taken off.

The Best Fiscal System.—He maintained that whether trade was prosperous or depressed, Free Trade was the best fiscal system to meet every contingency. We were passing through a time of great prosperity not confined to this country, but of great world-wide prosperity. How did Britain come out of that time? With the lion's share! In two years the exports of France increased—France being a great Protectionist country—by 27 millions, Germany increased by 56 millions, those of the United States by 62 millions, and Britain, decadent, her trade tumbling down, her factories closed, all markets of the world one by one shut in her teeth—Britain increased her trade by 100 millions.—MR. LLOYD GEORGE, in the *Queen's Hall*, February 28th, 1908.

COMMERCIAL POLICY.

The Trade Slump.

TRADE STATISTICS.—The first two years after the Armistice were years of good trade, imports and exports were large, and there was little unemployment. The Government were perfectly aware, however, that this would not last and that a period of severe depression was certain to set in. The following tables will show how trade fell off last year as compared with 1920:—

IMPORTS.

	1920. £	1921. £
Foodstuffs	765,807,875 ...	567,246,647
Raw materials	710,355,635 ...	271,175,698
Articles wholly or mainly manufactured	453,439,840 ...	245,045,553
Miscellaneous	3,045,531 ...	3,219,315
	£1,932,648,881	£1,086,687,213

Decrease 846 millions.

EXPORTS.

	1920. £	1921. £
Food-stuffs	59,936,451 ...	37,457,956
Raw materials	145,515,803 ...	63,559,256
Manufactures	1,119,739,723 ...	588,664,977
Miscellaneous	18,277,292 ...	13,514,093
	£1,334,469,269	£703,196,282

Decrease 631 millions.

The Government, however, made no serious attempt to provide for the coming depression, which its legislation of last year made much worse. As always happens when our imports, and consequently our exports, fall off, unemployment increased rapidly. In 1920 there was slightly over 3 per cent. of unemployment in January, and the rate fell to less than 1 per cent. in April. In September the first serious increase occurred, and unemployment rose to 6 per cent. at the end of the year. With the exception of a short period after the close of the coal lock-out it steadily increased all through last year, which closed at the terrible figure of 16.5. It is certain that but for the Government's legislation many hundreds of thousands of men then walking the streets would have been at work.

BUSINESS MEN'S PROTESTS.—When the resolutions on which the Safeguarding of Industries Bill were being discussed in the House, a long Free Trade Manifesto was issued, signed by the leading bankers of London. The Manifesto is too long to quote in full, but the following extract contains its spirit:—

The policy of trying to exclude the production of other countries, with the well-meant design of encouraging our own, cannot increase the volume of commerce or the total volume of employment here. But it may well compel the consumers, who form the bulk of our population, to submit to privations in the quality or quantity of the goods they buy. The importation of foreign goods does not diminish the activities of our people, because such goods can only be paid for by the produce of British Capital and Labour.

This was signed by twenty-six leading bankers representing practically the banking business of London.

TRUSTS AND COMBINES.

While the Coalition Government has been tinkering with our imports and obstructing our exports nothing has been done to prevent the harmful results of the accumulation of capital and control of prices and production by groups of private capitalists.

Official Committees under the Profiteering Acts have reported on the danger to the public; but the Coalition has done nothing. The following are some of the reports of these Committees which were formed of business men with a few Labour representatives and economists. The articles mentioned are those which are in the control of combines.

SOAP.—The United Kingdom Soap Manufacturers' Association fixes—directly for non-proprietary and, in our opinion, indirectly for proprietary soaps—the manufacturers' and retail minimum prices for 80 per cent. of the soaps sold in this country.

Those prices become the recognised prices of practically all soaps sold in this country; there is virtually no competition in price.

Thirty-seven of the principal soap-making firms, responsible for at least 70 per cent. of the total British output, constitute one group under the control of Lever Brothers Limited—referred to in the report as the "Lever Combine." The Lever Combine is responsible for 90 per cent. of the output of the United Kingdom Soap Manufacturers' Association, and has a majority of representatives on the Council of the Association and on each of its committees.

The Lever Combine dominates the Association and is in a position substantially to determine the price at which soap shall be sold in this country.

PROTECTING INEFFICIENCY.

While some improvements and economies of organisation have no doubt taken place through the extension of Lever Brothers' control, the evidence does not satisfy us that these economies have been substantial, or represent to the public any advantage comparable with the loss and danger involved to them in the fixing of excessive prices.

Since the prices fixed by the Association will usually be such as to afford to the least efficient member of the Association a sufficient profit, the system of price fixing by the Association tends to protect inefficiency and to ensure added prosperity to the efficient; it prevents prices falling as low as they would under a competitive system. The benefit of any economies that may be made by a particular manufacturer is, as a rule retained wholly by him in place of reaching the consumer.—(Cmd. 1126, pp. 16-17.)

YEAST.—The Distillers' Company, who are by far the most important manufacturers of yeast in this country and produce about 70 per cent. of the British output, have a controlling interest in the United Yeast Company, Limited, through which practically all their yeast is distributed. "They also have a pecuniary interest in several other distributing firms. The United Yeast Company, Limited, is the most important distributing firm; has more than 150 depots and branches, and last year sold about two-thirds of the yeast consumed in this country. . . . Seeing that the Distillers Company, Limited, produce about two-thirds of the British yeast, control the most important distributing firm and through it distributes practically their whole output, it is clear that they have a strong voice in all matters affecting the distributing trade." (Cmd. 1216, pp. 5-6.)

SEWING COTTON.—There are a number of competing sewing cotton manufacturing firms outside Messrs. Coats' control, but a witness, heard by us, estimates that 95 per cent. of the sewing cotton used for domestic purposes, and a very considerable portion of the sewing cotton used for manufacturing and other purposes, is made by Messrs. Coats and their subsidiary companies. To a very great extent, therefore, the supply and price of sewing cotton to the British public can be affected by Messrs. Coats and, at all events,

in the matter of the supply of sewing cotton for domestic purposes, we think they may be regarded as having virtually a monopoly.

SMALLER OUTPUT: BIGGER PROFITS.

Part of the capital of the company [Messrs. Coats] is invested in securities unconnected with the general business either at home or abroad. If this is eliminated, together with the revenue arising therefrom, the percentage return on the firm's capital rose from 14.26 per cent. in 1914 to 22.10 per cent in 1919, before the deduction of income tax and Excess Profits Duty. After deducting these taxes the return increased from 13.55 to 16.53 per cent. It is important to point out that the firm's output of sewing cotton in the year 1918-19 was 20 per cent. less by weight than in the year 1913-14. "With the output smaller," report the Committee, "it might have been expected that the firm's profits would have been correspondingly less, but instead, they are immensely higher, having increased from £2,634,388 in 1914 to £4,895,149 in 1919, an increase of 86 per cent.—(Cmd. 563, Cmd. 930 and Cmd. 1173.)

ELECTRIC LAMPS.—There is in the electric lamp industry a trade combination—the Electric Lamp Manufacturers' Association—which includes from 90 per cent. to 95 per cent. of the industry, controls factors and retailers, fixes prices at all stages, and regulates output.

The prices fixed by the Electric Lamp Manufacturers' Association become the standard prices for all lamps sold in this country, whether made by Association or non-Association manufacturers, or imported from abroad.

British lamp manufacturers outside the Association produce and sell to the trade (presumably at a profit) lamps of comparable quality at a lower price than Association firms.

Because of the standard price policy originated by the Association, non-Association lamps are sold to the public at the same price as Association lamps, the advantage on the lower-priced lamps going wholly to distributors. Hence, either Association manufacturers are making an undue profit or they manufacture less economically than non-Association makers.

The trading discounts received by factors and retailers are considerably higher than is necessary, and should be reduced.

Standard vacuum lamps now sold to the public at 3s. could be sold at 2s., at which price the manufacturer and the distributor would still have a satisfactory working profit.

PROFITEERING.

One and a-quarter million half-watt lamps, sold to the public in 1919 at 12s. 6d., were purchased in Holland by the three associated manufacturers at about 3s. per lamp.

The Electric Lamp Manufacturers' Association has been created primarily in the interests of three firms—the British Thomson-Houston Company, the General Electric Company and Messrs. Siemens Brothers. These impose onerous conditions upon other firms in the Association, e.g., a limitation of output upon licensees, and a stipulation that the validity of their patents shall not be questioned or disputed.

The limitation of output imposed upon licensees is contrary to the best interests of the industry and of the consumer.

Since the largest of the three dominant firms in the Association is under majority control of an American electrical concern, there is some danger of the interests of the British lamp industry being subordinated to American interests.

There is a possibility of an international combination, comprising British, Dutch and American manufacturers, which would be able to control supplies and dominate prices over a considerable part of the world.—(Cmd. 622, pp. 14-15.)

EXPLOSIVES.—The Associations fix the manufacturers' and retail minimum prices of practically all explosives, detonators and fog signals manufactured and sold in this country. Moreover, by reason of supplementary agreements with foreign manufacturers, these prices become the standard prices of practically all imported explosives; there is virtually no price competition.

Foreign competition may be said to be negligible except in the case of sporting and rifle ammunition, and there seems to be little prospect of its becoming severe in the near future in view of the agreements held by the Nobel Combine and the principal associations with foreign manufacturers which have for their purpose, amongst other things, the standardisation of prices and territorial restrictions of markets.

All the explosives companies in this country, with the exception of three relatively small concerns, constitute one group under the control of Nobel Industries Limited, referred to in our Report as the Nobel Combine.

This combine at the present time practically controls the policy of the various trade associations, and is thus able substantially to determine the prices at which explosives and detonators are sold in this country. The power of the Combine is not affected by the competition of the independent manufacturers, and there is nothing to prevent the Nobel Combine from maintaining prices at a higher level than they would have been had their constituent companies remained unassociated.—(Cmd. 1347, p. 11.)

MOTOR FUEL.—The concentration of control, over the price and disposition of motor fuel, in the hands of two enormously powerful capitalistic combines, practically world-wide in their scope, constitutes so dangerous a power, if it happens to be improperly used, that it is imperative that the Governments of the world should give some attention to it.

In view of the world-wide operations of these Trusts, it does not appear possible for the British Government by itself to deal effectively with this problem.

Their possession of the main sources of supply, the chief pipe lines, the tank steamers, and a considerable part of the distributing arrangements in the various consuming countries, practically prevents the setting up of any private competition which might operate to destroy their monopoly or force them to reduce their prices.

Experience in a number of industries during the war has shown the danger of attempting to fix prices without taking effective steps for securing supplies and controlling distribution.—(Cmd. 597, p. 3.)

"ALARMING SITUATION."

"The first and most important fact is that the prices of petroleum products are controlled by powerful combinations, whose financial resources are enormous and the scope of whose operations is world-wide. These combinations own the principal courses of supply, and their possession of the bulk of the distributive machinery renders effective competition impossible. Their possession of tank steamers

so obscures the position, that an entirely false impression is created as to the actual cost of freight. Competitive private enterprise is unable to set any effective check on the power of these combinations, and nothing less than Government action can affect this alarming situation."—(Cmd. 1119, p. 8.)

LIGHT CASTINGS.—The object the Association has in view is that of raising and keeping up the price to the buyer of goods and articles made and/or supplied by its members.

This shall be done by means of pooling arrangements so controlling production that prices will rise naturally and inevitably, as they always must do when supply is brought into equilibrium with or is ever so little below demand.

"PENALISES PROGRESS."

If no manufacturer, however favourably placed and however progressive, is to be allowed to increase the volume of his business disproportionately to the rest without paying a penalty, the result must be, we think, to put a drag upon expansion and improvement. In the words of one witness, an ironfounder who had been at one time a member of the N.L.C.A., it "penalises progress and encourages laziness." It must discount to some extent the incentive of the manufacturer to increase his trade; it must tend to make members refuse any order which will not yield a profit substantially greater than the pool percentage; it must tend to stereotype the lay-out of the industry.

We are of opinion that the powers of an association which wields such control over an industry are so open to abuse as to make it a menace to the community.—(Cmd. 1200.)

CEMENT.—That combines or trusts do exist in the cement industry.

That there exists what is generally referred to as 'The Combine' in the cement industry, and this combine consists of the Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited and the British Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited. Each of these two concerns constitutes an amalgamation of a number of firms and companies which formerly operated independently. The directorates of the Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited and the British Portland Cement Manufacturers Limited are interlocked so as to make the two concerns practically one company, and as such they produce about 75 per cent. of the cement manufactured in the British Isles.

That there exists, in addition, an organisation known as the Cement Makers' Federation, which includes in its membership manufacturers producing about 90 per cent. of the cement manufactured in the British Isles. This Federation deals with labour questions affecting the industry and fixes the minimum prices of the cement sold for home use by its members within the British Isles to merchants and others. The Federation also fixes the minimum prices to be charged by such merchants to the actual users.—(Cmd. 1091, p. 16.)

PIPES AND CASTINGS.—There is an effective combination of manufacturers of pipes and castings, namely, the Cast Iron Pipe Association, which fixes minimum prices and which comprises practically all manufacturers of cast iron pipes.

In view of the fact that prices are fixed by an association, the practice of submitting tenders has become, in fact, of no value as a protection to the ratepayer.

The municipal authorities are more or less at the mercy of the Cast Iron Pipe Association, as they are unable to secure pipes of British manufacture, except through members of the Association.—(Cmd. 1217, p. 5.)

The Speakers' Handbook

CUT NAILS.—An organisation known as the Cut Nails Association exists among the manufacturers of steel nails, and includes in its membership manufacturers producing 99 per cent. of the total production of this country.

This association fixes the minimum prices of all the nails manufactured by its members and maintains these prices by agreements and penalties. The association further controls the output of its members by means of a pooling system.

We are satisfied that the control exercised by the association effectively prevents competition among home manufacturers, and that in the absence of imports the consumer is compelled at the present time to pay the prices for his supplies which are fixed by the association. —(Cmd. 1268, p. 9.)

EFFICIENCY NOT THE OBJECT.

In the course of our investigation we have come across no combination whose primary object is to increase the efficiency of the business, but since our inquiry has not covered the whole ground it is possible such may exist. In every case examined the primary object has been to regulate prices. . . . A common practice on the part of several associations is to offer substantial rebates to merchants provided that they sign agreements to the effect that during the term of the agreement they have not purchased from non-associated manufacturers nor sold goods at less than schedule prices.

The builders' merchant without doubt plays an important part in many associations, for while in some cases he may hold the position of a man tied by the policy and regulations of a manufacturers' association, through the membership of which alone he can get his supplies of materials, in others he is a willing co-operator in the policy of keeping up the price of materials to the builder and the public.—(Cmd. 9236, p. 35.)

NATIONALISATION OF RAILWAYS.

COALITION PROMISES.

NOT GOING BACK.—Mr. Lloyd George, referring to the nationalisation of railways and canals, said that he was in complete sympathy with the general character of the proposals put forward. The credit of the State would enable them to pay lower interest for borrowed capital, to pay better wages to railway workers, and to provide better facilities to the travelling and the trading public. Under the old system they had had an excess of trains serving one district on account of competition, but in another district they had been in the hands of one railway, and there had been a dearth of facilities. He was certain that they could not go back to the old system.—[Reply to a deputation from the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee, March 20, 1918.]

NATIONALISATION POLICY.—Mr. Churchill said at Dundee on December 4, 1918, that the Government policy was the nationalisation of railways. That great step it had at last been decided to take.—(*The Times*, December 5, 1918.)

INDEPENDENT LIBERALS.—In May, 1916, Mr. Runciman, the President of the Board of Trade, was asked in the House of Commons if he was taking steps to pool all the railway wagons under one authority. He answered in the negative, adding:—

After looking very carefully into the subject I came to the conclusion that there would be no saving or increased efficiency by pooling privately-owned wagons. Compare this with Sir Eric Geddes's statements quoted below.

FAILURE OF COMPANY SYSTEM.—The Company system has broken down entirely. The Report of the Select Parliamentary Committee on Transport, issued in November, 1918, stated that there should be single ownership and single management of all the main railway systems. This was the unanimous finding of the Committee, which was composed of members of all parties. But, in the Railways Act, 1921, the Government has set up four railway trusts overlapping and competing with one another at various points, with permission to raise their rates until they are sufficient to bring in something more than the profits of 1913, which were the highest on record. The trade and industry of the country are thus sacrificed to the interests of private shareholders, and we have the first fruits of the Government policy in the English railway companies granting small, albeit inadequate, reductions on coal and iron whilst the Scottish companies flatly refuse to do the same.

THE WAGON SCANDAL.—Introducing the Railways Bill on March 17, 1919, Sir Eric Geddes, after pointing out the expensiveness and waste of the 700,000 privately-owned wagons, said:—

They are of a poor type and are not designed for economy in transportation, but to suit the particular private needs of the user. In every way they are hampering us. The percentage of saving in empty haulage

and in reduced shunting will be very great indeed. I am told that there is no doubt that it will exceed 20 per cent., and, if this Bill passes, one of the first acts which the Government will take will be to acquire on fair terms the private wagons of the country.

This promise has not been kept, as it conflicts with private ownership interests.

Speaking on the Second Reading debate upon the Bill for the establishment of a Ministry of Transport, on March 17, 1919, Sir Eric Geddes said that if the trader did not want to have 70 or 80 per cent. increase in goods rates he would have to help to make economies in the usage of wagons by reducing the haulage of empties. He said:—

There are 700,000 privately-owned wagons in this country, and those wagons go about the country all over the place empty, because of the conditions under which they work, and they have got to be shunted out and sorted out on the return journey. They cannot be used for back loading, and even with agreement it is very difficult to do it.

On July 7, 1919, Sir Eric Geddes returned to the subject, and, in his speech in the House of Commons, said:—

A Scotch railway took six specific points, and they found they reduced the shunting by 50 per cent. by being able to send wagons anywhere, instead of having to sort out individual empties to send to a particular destination.

If that was the case with the common user of railway-owned rolling-stock, how much more would it be the case when you have innumerable collieries and works, all of which must get back their particular wagons, which have to be sorted out of the empties which are in the yard.

DEFECTS OF THE GROUPING SYSTEM.—Every argument in favour of the grouping of the railway companies points logically and inevitably to national ownership and operation—a system which almost every country in the world and every self-governing British Dominion has adopted. The partial unification of the railways into four big companies, with its attendant simplification of capital, is manifestly a considerable improvement on the pre-war state of affairs, when the system was split up among some two hundred companies of varying size. It is also to the good that in future the railways should be under the nominal control of 102 directors, as compared with the pre-war system, when each of the 150 odd companies had its own set of officials and boards of directors, aggregating over 1,000; but the grouping falls short of its logical outcome, which would be complete unification. We have as yet Free Trade within our own borders, and the transport of one district is not confined to that district; the transport of parcels of goods in big and small lots is as nation-wide in extent as is the transport of post parcels (which, in accordance with the desire of the railways, are not allowed to exceed 11 pounds in weight), letters, etc. To be consistent, the Government should suggest the breaking up of the National Post Office into four post offices, each worked by a separate company.

ADVANTAGES OF NATIONALISATION.

Cheaper Fares.—Compare *third-class fares* charged (1914) on State railways and British, for journey of 370 miles (Manchester to London return):—

		s. d.
State Railways.	Belgium	14 2
	Denmark	14 4
	Switzerland	15 3
	Germany	20 0
Private Railways	United Kingdom	30 11

Cheaper Rates on Goods.—This means lower prices, more trade and therefore more employment.

A member of the Lincolnshire Farmers' Association sent 7,200 cabbages to Covent Garden, where they were sold for £15 os. 6d.; cartage came to £1 13s. 4d., commission £3 16s., and railway charges £9 10s. 8d.; the actual producer receiving three 2d. stamps!

Sir George Beharrel, of the Finance Department of the Ministry of Transport, at a conference of Press representatives, explaining the principles of the Railways Bill, May 12, 1921, said:—

The pre-war freight charges were high—higher than those of any other country—and as the policy of the Government was private ownership there must be some inducement for capital to flow into the industry. . . .

Saving Present Waste.—Nationalisation would save the present waste in administration and material.

To instance only a few of the examples of the waste entailed by the wholly unnecessary duplication of management, railway stations, and rolling stock, it may be mentioned that, so far as the imperfect statistics of the British railway companies permit of a comparison being made, the average goods and mineral train load in the United Kingdom is

less than 77 tons, as compared with 134 tons in Belgium and 172 in Germany; whilst the average goods and mineral wagon load daily is 19 cwt. in the United Kingdom, as compared with 1 ton 14 cwt. in Belgium, and 2 tons 11 cwt. in Germany.

"We would call attention to the amount of dead weight carried on British railways. The tare of an eight-ton wagon built to the Clearing House Regulations is 70 per cent. of the load, as against the 40 to 45 per cent. of the wagons of other countries."—From Report of Committee on Standardisation of Railway Equipment, 1918.

Public Criticism.—Under nationalisation the railway services could then be criticised effectively in Parliament; exactly as the Post Office is.

Greater Safety.—Because on state-owned railways, democratically administered by those in the railway service, greater care will be taken of life and safety of passengers and workers.

At the time of the Ditton accident on the London and North-Western Railway, in September, 1912, when 16 lives were lost and about 80 people injured, the financial article in *The Observer* contained the following passage:—

There is some nervousness in the market and among railway shareholders generally, however, lest the particularly distressing circumstances of the accident may not compel the Board of Trade to make more stringent regulations for safeguarding the travelling public, which would, of course, mean heavier expenditure for the railway in the near future.

Extract from official report, dated August 24th, 1912, by Colonel Sir H. A. Yorke, to the Board of Trade regarding an accident caused by breaking of a three-link coupling:—

It would be well for the railway companies to look into the strength and design of the coupling which is in general use on goods trains. . . . Great Britain, so far as my experience goes, is the only country that uses it. Even if a little more money were spent upon it, it would still remain the cheapest coupling in the world.

* * * * *

Everything in England is making for railway nationalisation as soon as political conditions will allow the Government time to take up the subject. I believe the railway

The Speakers' Handbook

employees, the shareholders, and the mass of the voters are in favour. The professional and business classes are no doubt intellectually opposed, but they are out of sympathy with the present railway management, perhaps owing to what Professor Dewsnup called its "undiplomatic and unconciliatory attitude," and they will not be active in opposition; nor even if they were, would they have the political weight necessary for success?

—(SIR W. M. ACWORTH, *Report of papers and discussions at the meeting of the American Economic Association, held at St. Louis, December, 1910.*)

LABOUR POLICY.

The policy of the Labour Party with regard to the railways is that they should be owned and operated as a national service in the interests of the whole community—the general public, the traders, the manufacturers, and the workers.

NATIONALISATION OF MINES.

IMPORTANCE OF COAL.—Coal made British wealth. Before coal was mined on a large scale this was a poor country with no prospects, which imported manufactures, and was a hewer of wood and a drawer of water amongst the nations. It was the unlocking of the coal seams which built British wealth. In the middle of the 18th century England and Wales and Scotland had a population of only 6,300,000; in the next 150 years, through the working of coal, this figure increased to nearly 40,000,000.—*Sir Leo Chiozza Money.*

Failure of Private Enterprise.

HEALTH AND SAFETY.—Miners suffer greatly from eye ailments like nystagmus, and from respiratory diseases. "Miners," Dr. Shuffelezotham told the Coal Industry Commission, " . . . are working practically in the dark, and very often at a high temperature, with an atmosphere charged with a good deal of moisture. . . . Great Britain is the only European country where there is no legislation to regulate the temperature at which men work in coal mines."* The miner, as Mr. John Robertson has said, is "always in the trenches." Here are the figures of accidents in mines for the last five years:†

	Fatal Accidents	Persons Injured and Off Work for more than Seven Days
1917	1395	Figures not available
1918	1420	available
1919	1183	118,529
1920	1130	118,490
1921	816†	—

Evidence is not wanting that many accidents could be avoided if profit-making considerations weighed less heavily with the management. There is a shortage of inspectors. "If I were liable to be called over the coals for every fatal accident that occurred in my division," said a Home Office witness to the Commission, "I may tell you that the staff of inspectors, if the Government inspectors are to be responsible, would have to be enormously increased."‡

MINERS' WAGES.—From the earliest days of the mining industry, when miners were slaves bought and sold with the mines, they have been grossly underpaid. The average wage paid to persons employed in the mines in the five years before the war was £82. During the war increases in wages lagged behind rising prices. "Average earnings rose to £169 for the quarter July to September, 1918, or 106 per cent., while the rise in food prices to March, 1919, was 120 per cent., and in the cost of living 115. Prior to the Sankey Award the mine-workers' real wages were lower in 1919 than in 1913.**

* Coal Industry Commission Reports, Vol. II., 18,377.

† Mines and Quarries Reports.

‡ Vol. I., 2508.

§ Lock-out lasted for 13 weeks.

** "The Nationalisation of the Coal Industry." By R. H. Tawney (Labour Party, 6d.). Page 8.

The Speakers' Handbook

The following table gives the approximate wages per shift paid to day wagemen in April, 1922:

	s.	d.
SOUTH WALES—		
Coal-getter	8	9
Labourer	6	4
DURHAM—		
Coal-getter	8	7
Labourer	5	9
SOUTH YORKS.—		
Coal-getter	13	9
Labourer	10	5
LANCS. & CHES.—		
Coal-getter	11	6
Labourer	8	1
SCOTLAND—		
Coal-getter	8	6
Labourer	6	11

THE PRESENT POSITION.—In normal times miners work five shifts a week. At the moment of writing broken time is general throughout the coalfield, and in the export districts many thousands of miners are on a coolie level of subsistence. Local authorities in South Wales and Scotland have to supplement the wages, even of miners who are lucky enough to be employed full time. The rates have become so burdensome that many authorities are on the verge of bankruptcy. The street corners of the mining villages are thronged with out-of-work men. Lads over school age, for whom there is no employment in the mines, are running wild, and many women and children are ill-clad and under-nourished. *The coal export trade, lost through the mismanagement of the Government and the cupidity of the coalowners, is being regained at the expense of the miners and their families.*

A SWEATED SALARIAT.—Not only has private enterprise failed to provide a living wage for the miners, but the highly-skilled supervisors—managers, surveyors, and the like—have been grossly underpaid. The Coal Mines Department supplied the following figures to the Commission (see Report, Vol. III., App. 66) relating to 57 per cent. of the collieries in the United Kingdom:

Salary, including bonus and value of house and coal	Number of Managers 1913	1919
£100 or less	4	2
£101 to £200	134	3
£201 to £300	280	29
£301 to £400	161	251
£401 to £500	81	213
£501 to £600	51	146
£601 and over	50	152

EXTRAVAGANT AND WASTEFUL.—"In my opinion the present system of individual ownership of collieries is extravagant and wasteful. That is a somewhat daring statement, but I am prepared to stand by it, whether viewed from the point of view of the industry as a whole, or from the national point of view, and, I think, by thoughtful persons on both sides, both the owners and workmen, that is pretty generally accepted."

This striking statement was made by Sir Richard Redmayne, ex-colliery manager and director, formerly

* Coal Industry Commission Report, Vol. I., 5208.

Nationalisation of Mines

principal technical adviser to the Coal Controller, in his evidence before the Coal Industry Commission.

Among the factors in this waste are duplication of shafts; separate buying of raw materials; faulty methods of drainage; inadequate equipment, especially in the matter of trams, tubs, timber, rails, etc.; shortage of horses and mechanical power; maintenance of barriers of coal between properties; failure to work the less lucrative seams; waste of small coal; loading freight expenses through the system of privately-owned wagons; failure to make the fullest use of by-products, and an entire lack of prevision and scientific organisation in the consumption of coal.

PROFITS.—Royalty owners take a toll of £6,000,000 a year from the mining industry. The total of profits and royalties of the coal mining industry (excluding profits from coke ovens and by-products) amounted to

£160,000,000

in the five years, 1914-18. The total pre-war capital was £135,000,000. In the war years average earnings rose by 106 per cent., while aggregate profits increased by 300 per cent. Under the Excess Profits Tax coalowners retained profits based on the standard of pre-war profits (1913 was a vintage year for coal dividends). The percentage taken by the Government was:

50 per cent. in the Finance Act of 1915
60 " " " 1916
80 " " " 1917

As the selling price of coal is determined by the less lucrative mines, it follows that the colliery companies which are fortunately situated make enormous profits. The following statement of share prices from "Wages, Prices, and Profits" (Labour Publishing Co.) speaks for itself:

Firm	Par Value of Share	Highest Price 1913	Highest Price since 1913	Percentage Increase since 1913
Cory (Wm.) & Son	£1	28/1½	78/9 (1920)	180
Lambert Bros.	£1	24/9	68/1 (1920)	175
Tredegar Iron & Coal ...	£1	23/9	39/9 (1918)	67
Weardale Steel, Coal and Coke	£1	21/-	36/6 (1918)	74

CONSUMERS FLEECE.—Coal passes through the hands of three or four sections of middlemen before it reaches the domestic consumer. There are about 1,500 factors, over 27,000 distributing merchants, and a great number of dealers. A Co-operative witness told the Coal Industry Commission that Co-operative Societies, while selling coal to the members at the same price as the private trader, were able to give back to the consumers a dividend of from 2s. 6d. to 5s. a ton.

In March, 1922, the price of house coal at the pithead was about 34s. a ton, and prices to the London consumer ranged between 52s. and £3. Foreigners are able to buy British coal cheaper than it is sold in this country. It is stated in the *Colliery Guardian* (March 24, 1922), that people living in the anthracite area of South Wales paid £2 11s. 2d. at the pithead for coal shipped at Swansea, after payment of railway and dock charges, at 35s. to 39s. 6d. a ton.

The Commission and the Government.

THE SANKEY REPORT.—"Even upon the evidence already given the present system of ownership and working in the coal industry stands condemned, and some other system must be substituted for it, either nationalisation or a

method of unification by national purchase, and/or by joint control.

"We are prepared, however, to report now that it is in the interests of the country that the colliery worker shall in the future have an effective voice in the direction of the mine. For a generation the colliery worker has been educated socially and technically. The result is a great national asset. Why not use it?"—Report signed by Mr. Justice Sankey, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Arthur Duckham, and Sir Thomas Royden.

GOVERNMENT'S BROKEN PROMISES.—The Home Secretary in the House of Commons on February 24, 1919:

It is a pure business proposition; and, if it turns out on investigation that it is for the good of the country as a whole that the mines should be nationalised, that the people of the country would be better off if the mines were worked under a nationalised system, rather than under private ownership, then it is a good business proposition, and should accept it. . . .

The Government desire to go into the matter to see if it is a good business proposition. If it is that I accept it.

* * * * *

Mr. Bonar Law in the House of Commons on March 20, 1919.

In regard to this whole report we have had it discussed at the Cabinet this afternoon, and I say now on behalf of the Government that **we are prepared to adopt the Report in the spirit as well as in the letter**, and to take all the necessary steps to carry out its recommendations without delay.

* * * * *

Mr. Lloyd George announced in the House of Commons on August 18 that the Government was not going to accept the finding in favour of nationalisation. Mr. Vernon Hartshorn supplied the appropriate comment.

Why was the Commission set up? Was it a huge game of bluff? Was it never intended that if the reports favoured nationalisation we were to get it? Why was the question sent at all to the Commission? That is the kind of question the miners will ask, and they will say, "**We have been deceived, betrayed, duped.**"

* * * * *

ADVANTAGES OF NATIONALISATION.—Under nationalisation the 1,000,000 workers employed in and about the mines would be guaranteed healthier and safer working conditions, a higher standard of living than they have hitherto enjoyed, and participation in the management of the industry. Consumers will benefit from a cheaper and more efficient service. Economies will be effected by abolishing the 4,000 separate proprietors. Landowners will not be able, as now, to impede developments by demanding unreasonable terms. Coal will not be lost through improper drainage, and through the "creaming" of pits. Backward mines will be better equipped. Trusts and middlemen will be eliminated. Coal for domestic purposes will be distributed by local authorities. The supply of coal will not be limited by constantly-recurring industrial disputes. For a fuller summary of the advantages that would accrue from the public ownership of the mines see *The Nationalisation of the Coal Industry*, by R. H. Tawney. (Labour Party, 33, Eccleston Square, S.W.1. Price, 7d. post free); *Nationalisation of the Mines*, by Frank Hodges (Parsons, 4s. 6d.); *Workers' Control in the Coal Mining Industry*, by Frank Hodges (1d. Labour pamphlet.)

THE MINERS' BILL.—A Bill, prepared by the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, provides for the setting up of a Mining Council consisting of 20 members, ten appointed by the King, and ten by the Miners' Federation, under the presidency of a Minister of Mines. All mines and minerals, rights and easements are to be transferred to the Mining Council. The purchase price of the mines is based on an annual output computation, and compensation is payable in the form of State Mines Stock. Powers are given the Mining Council to open and work mines and ancillary services, and to acquire land. There are provisions for District and Pit Councils, and for the appointment of a Fuel Consumers' Council. Disputes between the Mining Council and the Miners' Federation of Great Britain are, failing settlement, to be referred to arbitration on terms mutually agreed. One of the final sections of the Bill reads:

It shall be the duty of the Mining Council to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of fuel at reasonable prices throughout Great Britain.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Course of Unemployment Since the Armistice.

	No. of work- people regis- tered at Em- ployment Ex- changes.	Percentage of Unemploy- ment (trade unions).	Workers registered as working systematic short time.
1918. December ...	—	0.5	—
1919. June ...	—	0.9	—
December ...	457,275	2.8	—
1920. June ...	287,000	1.2	—
December ...	748,000	6.1	446,486
1921. June ...	2,177,899	23.1	832,340
December ...	1,865,170*	15.9	268,148
1922. Jan. 31 ...	1,905,913	16.8	287,499

Industries Where Unemployment was Acute.

	No. of Un employed	Percentage of Unemployment.
Building ...	149,549	19.0
Works of Construction ...	34,539	29.4
Shipbuilding ...	122,768	34.5
Engineering and Iron Foundry ...	291,273	26.5
Iron, Steel and Tinplate ...	94,583	32.3
Seamen ...	31,307	18.9

LABOUR WARNINGS.

Party Resolutions.

PREVENTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT.—At the Annual Conference of the Labour Party in 1917 a resolution was passed calling on the Government to adopt a policy of PREVENTING unemployment. Measures recommended to this end included arranging public works and the orders of the National Departments and local authorities in such a way as to maintain the aggregate demand for labour. The Government was urged to put instantly in hand the work of re-housing the population; to make good the shortage of schools and other educational institutions; to build new roads and light railways and to re-organise the canal system; to undertake afforestation, reclaim land, improve ports and harbours, and open up the land by small holdings and other means.

It was suggested that the pressure of an over-stocked labour market should be relieved by raising the school-age to 16, increasing facilities for secondary and higher education, and shortening the hours of labour of all young persons to enable them to attend classes in the day time.

TEN YEARS' PROGRAMME.—At the Annual Conference of the Labour Party in 1918, a resolution was passed calling on the Government to undertake a ten years' programme on the lines recommended above, and adding:

There is no excuse for any Government which allows such a grave social calamity as widespread and lasting unemployment ever to occur.

* These figures represent 1,505,590 men and 359,580 women.
† December, 1921.

MAINTENANCE.—The Annual Conference of the Labour Party in 1919 demanded full and adequate maintenance to the Trade Union concerned in respect of—
Any person having no situation.

Mothers with dependent children, to enable the mothers to remain at home and not enter the labour market.

Juveniles leaving school or becoming unemployed below the age of 18.

Women receiving training under the Government's scheme.

Unemployed women whose out-of-work donation had ceased.

COALITION PROMISES.

"ELIMINATING" UNEMPLOYMENT.—It was in February, 1919, that Mr. Lloyd George called a special conference of representatives of workers and employers. That assembly, which the chairman, Sir Robert Horne, said had "no parallel in our history," was addressed by the Prime Minister, who drew attention, amongst other things, to the curse of unemployment. "During the war," he said, "the workers have been removed for four-and-a-half years from the terrible dread of unemployment, and it is only those who have lived in industrial homes who can realise what a horror that prospect is. For four-and-a-half years that has been eliminated from their lives; it has been taken away from the horizon. Now peace has been established, and the spectre re-appears, and there is a general feeling that something must be done to suppress it, to destroy it, to eliminate it for ever out of the lives of the workers. These are questions that have to be examined and have to be determined."

"A NEW WORLD."—In September, 1919, ten months after the Armistice, Mr. Lloyd George declared, in the columns of *The Future*, for "a new world." The old world, he said, was one "where unemployment through the vicissitudes of industry, brought despair to multitudes of humble homes. . . . If we renew the lease of that world we shall betray the heroic dead. . . . The old world must and will come to an end. No effort can shore it up much longer. If there be any who feel inclined to maintain it, let them beware lest it fall upon them and overwhelm them and their households in ruins."

LABOUR POLICY.

Emergency Measures Recommended.

At the Special Conference of the Labour Party in January, 1921, there was passed a resolution—

(i.) Declaring that the growing volume of unemployment is largely due to the failure of the Government to secure the resumption of trade with Russia and Central Europe;

(ii.) condemning the Government for not having taken timely action for the prevention of unemployment, as suggested by Labour;

(iii.) calling for immediate action to provide employment at wages, and where this is not done, to arrange for the provision of maintenance at not less than 40s. per week for each householder, with 25s. per week for each single man or woman, with additional allowances for dependents.

The Conference, whilst not ignoring the more fundamental causes of recurrent unemployment, concentrated attention upon the measures necessary to meet the present emergency, and called for

The Speakers' Handbook

A TRADE POLICY :

- (a) The immediate adoption of the policy of unobstructed trade with Russia;
- (b) such an application of the terms of peace with enemy countries as will promote the restoration of their economic life and re-establish normal commerce;
- (c) concerted international arrangements for the stabilisation of the exchanges, the extension of credits, together with the promotion of commercial intercourse, and an unobstructed transport system throughout Europe;

AN EXPENDITURE POLICY :

The Conference, moreover, called upon the Government immediately to reverse its policy with regard to expenditure—

- (d) By bringing promptly to an end its military adventures in Mesopotamia and elsewhere in the East;
 - (e) by terminating its military oppression and lawless reprisals in Ireland, which are stopping productive industry and lessening the economic resources of the country. At the same time, the Conference demanded the reversal of the policy of attempting to arrest the necessary growth of much needed services of public utility, as for example—
 - (a) Postponing, as far as possible, the carrying into effect of the Education Act of 1918, and discouraging all developments by the Local Education Authorities;
 - (b) slowing down, and in many cases actually obstructing, the building of the urgently required houses;
 - (c) discouraging and forbidding Local Authorities from carrying out much-needed local works of improvement.
- The Conference declared that, in a period of unemployment, the policy of the Government should be one of expansion, not of contraction, of rightful and economical public expenditure; and that the necessary public works and services which must certainly be executed within each decade, ought to be, as far as possible, concentrated on the years of industrial depression, so as to avoid the waste of keeping workers in idleness upon unemployment benefit.

WORK TO BE UNDERTAKEN.

It further declared that at the moment there was a vast amount of necessary work waiting to be undertaken, which it would be greatly to the public advantage to put in hand at once, and which would ensure regular employment at wages for hundreds of thousands of men and women, such as—

- (i.) The immediate ordering by all the Government Departments and Local Authorities of the stores and necessary works which will in any case be required in the course of the next three years;
- (ii.) the prohibition of all overtime (except where absolutely necessary to enable other workers to be started) in order to minimise the number of workers to be discharged;
- (iii.) the complete restoration and development up to fullest efficiency of the road system (including new traffic arteries), waterways, and canals, and the railway tracks, locomotives, wagons and coaches;
- (iv.) the putting in hand of the national schemes for the economical generation of electric power in bulk;
- (v.) the erection and equipment of the additional school buildings which are urgently required, and the cleansing and restoration of all public buildings;
- (vi.) the prompt carrying out of the schemes of afforestation actually prepared by the Forestry Commissioners;
- (vii.) the development of agriculture by bringing a greater acreage under the plough and speeding up the provision of small holdings and additional allotments;
- (viii.) the immediate pressing forward of the schemes for harbour improvement and land reclamation which the Development Commission has been preparing in view of the present crisis, but which the Government is now seeking to hold up.

Unemployment

PREFERABLE TO RELIEF WORK.

The Conference declared that such a policy was preferable to that of relief works, which are wasteful and demoralising, extravagantly costly to the ratepayer and taxpayer, and which do not meet the needs either of the skilled workman or of the woman.

The Conference believed that, if the policy of enlarging employment for useful purposes were everywhere adopted, there would be little or no need for any policy of short time; but the Conference insisted that, wherever short time was adopted, it should be accompanied, in order to prevent a disastrous lowering of the standard of life, by an under-employment allowance on the same scale as that proposed for unemployment benefit.

Further, with a view to absorbing a certain proportion of the men and women for whom the Labour Exchanges were unable to find employment, the Conference called upon the Government to fulfil its pledge to the Industrial Conference of 1919 by the immediate passing into law of a measure restricting the working day to eight hours.

MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES.

But as no remedial measure could take effect immediately, the Conference emphatically declared that the maintenance of the whole wage-earning class in strength and health—whether or not it suited the capitalists to find employment at wages—must be regarded as a first charge upon the national revenue; and the Conference called upon the Government at once to establish the necessary scheme of maintenance allowances both for the unemployed and the under-employed.

The Conference protested against the attempts made to take advantage of the crisis by reducing wages, and in particular by hampering, and even attacking the existing Trade Board machinery for establishing and maintaining a legal minimum wage in the lowest-paid industries; it called upon Trade Unions to resist to the utmost any effort to destroy the workers' standard of life by such means, and to report immediately to the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party any movements in this direction, so that the two National Executives might give their united assistance to the Unions whose wage standards are threatened.

Finally, the Conference reaffirmed its conviction that, however indispensable its present emergency proposals, the larger problem of unemployment arising from the very nature of the capitalist system still remained to be dealt with, and could be solved only on the principle so repeatedly enunciated by Labour.

A JOINT MANIFESTO.—The following is a summary of a Manifesto by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress and the National Executive of the Labour Party:—

Unemployment is a national problem, and ought not to be made a local burden. The Government's proposals place the burden on the backs of the ratepayers and inflict the heaviest burden on the areas whose affliction is already the greatest.

Labour's policy proposes—

The stimulation of production for exchange by the method of Government orders.

National and local public works of social utility, preference being given to schemes which will create a further demand for labour.

Adequate grants-in-aid and loans to local authorities.

Adequate maintenance for those for whom employment cannot be found.

RECONSTRUCTION OF TRADE.—Some proposals for the reconstruction of normal trade, submitted to the Government by the "Unemployment Delegation" of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, and the Labour Party Executive, October, 1921:—

A bold scheme of trading for Government account with Russia.

Carefully thought-out reconstruction schemes for the Central European, Baltic and Balkan States.

A reconsideration of German reparation payments, especially on the lines of taking payment in kind in the form of work done for European reconstruction.

Remission of debts due from our chief Allies.

Government assistance in the form of guarantees to long term loans for schemes of capital expenditure and development (railways, etc.). These would be most easily handled if they were schemes within the British Empire, but they need not necessarily be confined to this.

An export credit scheme.

LONDON LABOUR PROPOSALS.—Proposals (October, 1921) of the London Labour Party for the provision of work:—

Housing, town planning and slum clearances, and the establishment of new towns or garden cities in the Home Counties.

The further provision of schools.

Scheme for providing a more cheap and abundant supply of electricity for commercial and domestic purposes.

Passenger traffic development, including tube extensions.

Reclamation of the foreshores of the River Lea, and the putting into a state of efficiency of the banks and locks and other works of the River Thames.

Street widenings, construction and improvement of bridges, and other public improvement schemes.

Transformation of neglected private, semi-private and public squares into pleasant public recreation grounds.

Improvement and development of the Port of London.

EMPLOYMENT OF JUVENILES.—Some proposals of the Labour Party in connection with the employment of juveniles:—

"On August 26th, 1921, there were 108,000 boys and girls on the Live Register of the Employment Exchanges. This figure, which by no means expresses the total number of boys and girls out of work, does, however, give some indication of the reality of juvenile employment. During the two months previous to August 26th about as many young people left school to seek employment as were out of work towards the end of August. In so far as the new entrants got work, they got it at the expense of older boys and girls, and it may be, even at the expense of adults. It is clear that the entrance of new workers into industry during a trade depression can but increase the volume of unemployment; and it follows that the only wise course to be taken is temporarily to stop the outflow of pupils from the schools until there is a prospect of their being absorbed without thrusting employed workers into unemployment. We think that children who would normally be entitled to leave school during a period of unemployment should be required to continue in attendance, and that maintenance grants should be paid to them."

Unemployment

COALITION ACTION.

(1) Failure Abroad.

The Peace Treaty farce and the complete failure of the Allies to restore peace conditions in Europe and to re-open trade relationships with Russia, is described under other headings.

According to *The Times* (January 9th, 1922), Mr. Lloyd George now advocates "concessions to Germany, loans to Bolsheviks and the recognition of the Soviet Government," but it is too late to convince France that "he is moved by pure unselfish care for the interests of the world," and is not merely "preparing for the next General Election."

The following tables give some indication of the damage done to our export trade since the war:—

OUR EXPORT TRADE.—This table gives the net tonnage of the ships which entered our own ports during 1913 and 1920, respectively, from Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian ports, and also of the ships which cleared from our ports to ports in these countries. This is not, of course, an accurate measure of imports and exports, but it is a fair enough indication for purposes of comparison between two years:—

	1913		1920	
	Entered.	Cleared.	Entered.	Cleared.
RUSSIA:				
Northern Ports	3,315,243	3,296,217	432,492	75,488
Southern Ports	566,534	327,945	105,246	40,349
Pacific Ports ...	61,921	36,752	26,659	2,839
GERMANY ...	2,537,581	5,810,076	603,215	760,122
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY	128,758	619,794	20,554	47,888
Total ...	6,610,037	10,090,784	1,188,166	926,686

We shipped directly in 1920 to Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian ports less than one-tenth of what we sent out in 1913.

* * * * *

VALUE OF EXPORTS.—The following table gives in pounds sterling the value of all our exports to these three countries for 1913, for 1920 and for 1920 at pre-war prices:—

	1913. £	1920. £	1920
			At Pre-War Price.
RUSSIA	18,103,000	11,893,000	3,172,000
GERMANY	40,677,000	21,723,000	5,792,000
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY	4,480,000	3,969,000	1,060,000
Total	63,260,000	37,585,000	10,024,000

On this basis of reckoning our exports in 1920 to Central Europe and Russia, when reduced to pre-war values, were 15 per cent. of our exports for 1913. The decline of our trade with Germany, Russia and Austria would alone account for most of our present unemployment.

Russia is in need of every conceivable manufactured article, from boots and clothing to nails and screws. Above all, she requires machinery, especially agricultural machines and electrical plant.

(2) Failure at Home.

PROVISION OF WORK.—The Government has done practically nothing to stem the tide of unemployment. At the end of 1920, it set up an **UNEMPLOYMENT GRANTS COMMITTEE**, under Lord St. Davids, with a fund of £3,000,000, which it was empowered to use for the assistance of local authorities undertaking local schemes of work for the relief of unemployment; but the terms on which assistance was given were so onerous that local authorities made little use of the Committee. Although, at a later stage, the Government enabled the Committee to offer rather more generous assistance, the scheme was too small to be of any real value.

Up to the middle of October, 1921, when the scheme had been in operation nearly ten months, the total amount allocated by the Unemployment Grants Committee was £2,332,000.

Dr. Macnamara stated in the House of Commons on March 22nd, 1921, that £800,000 had been spent out of the fund. The Ministry of Transport, according to a statement made in the House of Commons on October 26th, 1921, had allocated from November, 1918, up to date, by way of grants to local authorities towards relief work carried out by them, £3,361,581 by way of grants and £1,821,988 on loan, but there were no appreciable results.

Further measures were adopted at the end of 1921. Under the **TRADE FACILITIES ACT**, the Government agreed to set aside £25,000,000 over a period of twelve months to guarantee the payment of loans to be applied towards "the carrying out of any capital undertaking, or in the purchase of articles manufactured in the United Kingdom for the purpose of any such undertaking," provided that "the Treasury is satisfied that any such loan is calculated to prevent unemployment in the United Kingdom." A second Act authorised loans to local authorities themselves, who were hard put to it to find the money for interest and repayment. The Cabinet Unemployment Committee was obliged to modify its original scheme and to raise the Government grant from 50 per cent. to 65 per cent. of the interest and repayment charges on non-revenue producing work.

The Government policy in other directions has been directly calculated to aggravate unemployment.

HOUSING.—On the plea of "economy," local housing schemes have been deliberately held up by the Government (see under "Housing," page 92). Meanwhile, there are 150,000 building operatives out of work.

EDUCATION.—The Government has postponed the operation of the Education Act (1918), both for the purpose of raising the school age to fourteen, and outside London for the purpose of continuation classes (see under "Education," page 99), so that children continue to stream into occupations which are not protected by the Women, Young Persons' and Children's Act. Similarly, the building of new schools, which was already behindhand in 1914 and held up during the war, has now come practically to a standstill. The Board of Education has recently issued a circular informing local authorities that restrictions on expenditure will continue at least during the year 1922-23, and that no schemes of which the total cost amounts to more than £1,000 in capital expenditure or £50 in annual rent will be considered.

Unemployment

WORKERS' STANDARD OF LIVING.—Nothing has been done by the Government either to maintain standard rates of wages or (apart from the Civil Service) to regulate reductions in relation to the fall of prices. On the contrary, legislation for this purpose has been deliberately withheld or withdrawn. The purchasing-power of the workers has been depressed accordingly to a disproportionate extent.

The *Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act*, which was passed at the time of the Armistice so as to prevent a general slump of wages, was withdrawn in September, 1920, just at the moment when unemployment was becoming acute.

The new *Trade Boards* promised by the Government, to take the place of the *Wages (Temporary Regulations) Act* have not been established. (See under "Trade Boards.") In the House of Commons (August, 1921), Lady Astor declared that in Newcastle some women in the catering trade were being paid 4s. a week for ten hours daily; in Sunderland, 8s. and 10s. for twelve hours daily, including Sunday work.

In July, 1921, the Government destroyed the *Agricultural Wages Board*, which has left agricultural workers practically helpless. Agricultural workers in many places are earning 30s. a week and under. This figure is equivalent to little more than 15s. before the war.

The Government combined with the coal owners to oppose the miners' demand for the adjustment of wages on a national basis. Consequently, day rates have been fixed in some districts which, for certain classes of labourers, do not amount to more than 26s. or 28s. a week (viz.: 13s. or 14s. pre-war value).

MINERS' WAGES.—Some day-rates fixed for miners in various areas (November, 1921):—

	Colliers.	Underground Labourers.	Surface Labourers.
Forest of Dean ...	7/5	5/10	5/3
Bristol ...	7/6	6/8	5/6
Cumberland ...	9/1	7/9	6/6
S. Wales ...	8/10	6/5	6/5
N. Wales ...	9/6	7/6	6/4

PAYMENT FOR RELIEF WORK.—In November, 1921, the Government issued a circular to local authorities, laying down that where they employ direct unskilled labour on relief works, they shall not pay more than 75 per cent. of the district rate of wages for such labour. This arbitrary proceeding inevitably reacted unfavourably on standard rates of wages. It was not until after the outcry made by the Poplar Borough Council that the Government agreed that standard rates should be paid to unskilled workmen who were "certified competent" by the borough surveyor or engineer.

HOURS OF WORK.—The Government has refused to ratify the Washington Convention prescribing an eight-hour day (see under "Washington Conventions"). Employers are claiming accordingly an extension of the working week, which in factories not employing full staff can only result in further discharges. The cotton and woollen manufacturers are asking for an extension from 48 to 55½ hours, although 80,000 cotton operatives and 38,000 woollen operatives are already out of work.

The Speakers' Handbook

MAINTENANCE.

The Government provision of maintenance for the unemployed is quite inadequate, causing both bitter suffering and acute contraction of purchasing power in large groups of workers. The Unemployment Act of 1920 extended unemployment insurance to a larger number of industries (agriculture, domestic service, and the Civil Service were not included), and established benefits of 15s. per week for men and 12s. for women.

In March, 1921, a further measure increased the benefits to 20s. and 16s. per week respectively; but in the following July benefits were again reduced to 15s. for men and 12s. for women, and contributions were increased by 1d. per week. (viz.: 4d. to 5d. for men and 3d. to 4d. for women).

In November, the Government was obliged to consider the acute distress among families of the unemployed, and the Unemployed Workers' Dependents Act provides that during a period of six months from the passing of the Act, unemployed workers shall receive an additional benefit of 5s. a week in the case of a wife, and 1s. a week in the case of a dependent child (the total sum not to exceed 9s.), but the workers remaining employed are required to contribute a full share of the cost, their contributions being raised for this purpose by 2d. a week for men and 1d. a week for women and young people.

Moreover, if there is any deficiency in the fund at the end of six months, owing to a greater number being unemployed than estimated for, the workers' contributions shall be continued until the deficiency is made good. Benefits under the Insurance Acts must be taken into account in granting out-relief—a contingency apparently contemplated by the Government in passing the Acts.

Unemployed workers are not entitled, under the temporary provisions of the Insurance Acts, to benefit during the whole period of unemployment, but for a period of sixteen weeks in each of two "special periods" extending from March, 1921, to October, 1921, and from November, 1921, to July, 1922.

It is estimated that at the end of October 6,000,000 unemployed workers had fallen out of benefit.

INCREASING THE RATES.—The following table shows some effects of inadequate national provision for the unemployed on local rates:—

Statement of Out-relief within the Poplar Union.

1920.	Total No. of cases.	Total Amount of Relief.
Last week in		
July 31st ...	1,617	£1,316 19 7
August 28th ...	1,661	1,350 3 5
September 25th ...	1,653	1,365 17 11
October 30th ...	1,935	1,691 12 4
November 27th ...	2,174	1,879 14 5
December 25th ...	2,301	2,528 8 10*

1921.	Total No. of cases.	Total Amount of Relief.
Last week in		
July 30th ...	5,083	£5,611 7 10
August 27th ...	5,496	6,135 0 11
September 24th ...	6,605	7,520 13 10
October 29th ...	7,893	8,975 2 9
November 26th ...	7,414	8,684 11 7½
December 24th ...	7,225	11,307 7 4½*

OUT-RELIEF.—In the eleven months between the first week in December, 1920, and the last week in October, 1921, the number of persons in receipt of out-relief in London alone rose from 48,000 to 185,000, and has increased four-fold throughout the country as a whole.

* Amount includes extra relief in respect of Christmas.

Unemployment

At the end of November, 1921, the total number of outdoor recipients in Great Britain was 906,618. The number had increased by 623,564 (or 388.7 per cent.) since November 1920.

Distributed From Trade Union Funds.

OUT-OF-WORK PAY.

The following table shows some effects of the inadequate provision of unemployment benefit on trade union funds in the year ending September 30th, 1921:—

Group		£
1.	Mining and Quarrying	792,839
2.	Railways	735,898
3.	Transport	112,101
4.	Shipbuilding	213,364
5.	Engineering, Founding and Vehicle Building	2,257,180
6.	Iron and Steel and Minor Metal Trades	625,755
7.	Building, Woodworking and Furnishing	221,991
8.	Printing and Paper	297,586
9.	Cotton	736,088
10.	Textiles	269,974
11.	Clothing	48,400
12.	Leather and Boot and Shoe	126,363
13.	Glass, Pottery, Chemicals, Food, Drink, Tobacco, Brushmaking and Distribution	214,382
14.	Agriculture	—
15.	Public Employees	6,767
16.	Non-manual workers	7,232
17.	General Workers	768,290
Total	£7,434,199

EMIGRATION.—In view of the Prime Minister's advocacy of emigration as one means of relieving distress from unemployment, the following passage from a speech he delivered at Bedford on October 11, 1913, has its interest:

"Walking along the principal streets of our great cities, you will see displayed advertisements calling attention to the allurements of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand for British labour. There you will find a picture of a nice home, with most beautiful surroundings. There you will see a large tract of land just before the harvest, thick with corn bowing gracefully under golden ears. There you will find cattle grazing on rich pastures, and there again you will see an orchard laden with fruit, and no doubt not a landlord anywhere to be seen, and not a gamekeeper. During recent years these advertisements have attracted scores, nay, hundreds of thousands, of our best labourers to find a home across the flood. And point has been given to it by contrasting their experiences and the difficulties of winning a decent livelihood for themselves at home. Do you know when the land question will be settled in England and Scotland and Wales? It will be when similar advertisements setting forth the attractions of settlement on British soil will be displayed in some of the most prominent windows of the streets of every city and town in the land. Then you will have picture and print assuring the British workman that he need not flee across oceans and continents in order to find food and freedom and contentment, and plenty for himself, his wife, and his little children; that they can find it in the old homeland they love so well."

TRADE BOARDS.

How They Are Attacked.

PRESENT SITUATION.—Under the 1909 and the 1918 Trade Boards Acts there are sixty-three Boards, covering roughly two-and-a-half million workers.

As a result of the opposition of certain sections of employers, the Government appointed a Committee, under the chairmanship of Lord Cave, "to inquire into the working and effects of the Trade Boards Acts, and to report what changes, if any, are required." This Committee is still taking evidence, and is expected to report early this year.

GOVERNMENT INACTION AND OPPOSITION.—It was expressly understood at the time of the passage of the 1918 Act that it was intended that this machinery should be used for the reconstruction period, and definite pledges were made to the Trade Unions at a conference summoned by the Minister of Labour in January, 1919, that Trade Boards should be set up with the greatest possible speed. These pledges were repeated from time to time to deputations and in the House of Commons. More particularly when the Trade Unions claimed some extension of Part III of the Industrial Courts Act, which expired on September 30th, 1920, it was pointed out that the situation had been largely met by Trade Boards, and that it was proposed in the near future to increase the number.

Although considerable delay occurred, many Boards were set up, and for a time it appeared that the Minister intended to fulfil his pledges. About March, 1921, however, when a large proportion of the staff engaged in the preliminary investigations necessary for setting up Trade Boards were discharged, it appeared that the Government had determined upon a reversal of their policy. No further progress was made in the bulk of the Distributive Trades, the Catering Trade, and other trades in which Trade Boards had been promised, and the statements of the Minister of Labour in the House of Commons and elsewhere became more and more cautious.

INVESTIGATORS DISMISSED.—The facts with regard to the dismissal of the investigation staff are as follows:—A staff of 91 were employed on this work, composed of 36 women investigators, 24 men investigators, and 31 indoor staff. Eighty out of a staff of 91 received notices to leave terminating on March 31st. In 32 cases the notices have been rescinded. It will be seen, therefore, that a staff of 91 will be reduced to 43 on March 31st.

This policy of sudden suspension is absolutely illogical, in view of the fact that the proposed new Boards affected are in many cases the worst trades in which delay has been caused by the formidable opposition put up by the employers.

INVESTIGATIONS IN PROGRESS.—On March 16th, 1921, the Minister of Labour stated that orders had already been made to apply Trade Boards in the following trades: Fish Distributive Trade; Fruit Distributive Trade; Hair-dressing Trade; Boot and Floor Polish Manufacturing Trade; Whip-making Trade.

Notice of intention had been given in the Meat Distributive Trade and the Lace Warehousing and Finishing Trade. Only in one case, i.e., Boot and Floor Polish, has the Trade Board actually been set up.

EMPLOYERS' PRESSURE.—Meanwhile, apparently encouraged by the measure of success which had already been achieved, the opposition of certain sections of the employers increased, and resolutions from Chambers of Commerce and certain Employers' Associations poured upon Members of Parliament, and were written up extensively in the Press. In most cases this opposition did not come from employers who had had any considerable experience of Trade Boards. On the contrary, many of the older Boards have passed unanimous resolutions from Employers' and Workers' sides, placing on record their belief that the establishment of a Trade Board had been of considerable advantage to the trade as a whole.

KINDS OF OPPOSITION.—If we analyse the opposition to which the Government is apparently yielding, it appears that the attitude of employers to Trade Boards is of three kinds—

1. Many employers, including those connected with the Boards which have been established for some years, are entirely in favour of the principle of Trade Boards;
2. Certain employers, though not hostile to Trade Boards in principle, are irritated by existing administrative difficulties;
3. Certain employers are undoubtedly anxious to avoid new Boards, and dispose of the existing ones, in order that they may be perfectly free to pay low wages.

TRIBUTE TO TRADE BOARDS.—With regard to the first set of employers, a Trade Boards Administrative Committee was recently set up to make recommendations with respect to the work of the Trade Boards, and the administration of the Trade Boards Act. This Committee, consisting of four representative employers on Trade Boards, four workers, certain appointed members, and representatives of the Ministry of Labour, record the following opinion at the outset of their report:—

That Trade Boards have been a potent means for securing and maintaining industrial harmony in the trades for which they have been established. It will be recalled that the establishment of Trade Boards in trades which were insufficiently organised to establish a Joint Industrial Council was recommended by the "Whitley Council" as a means of improving relations between employers and employed, and that the National Industrial Council of 1919 advocated the immediate establishment of Trade Boards in the less well-organised trades. We consider that the almost entire absence of industrial unrest in trades covered by Trade Boards, even in the difficult periods, during and after the war, of extreme and rapid fluctuations of money values, is a great tribute to the power of a Trade Board to settle rates of wages on a firm basis. It is significant that during the last few days both the Wholesale Mantle and Costume Trade Board (Great Britain) and the Dressmaking and Women's Light Clothing Trade Board (England and Wales) have, as a result of their first year's experience, unanimously passed resolutions expressing their sense of the value of a Trade Board.

BESPOKE TAILORS' VIEWS.

The resolutions of Trade Boards referred to in the foregoing section are very interesting. The following was passed by the Ready-Made and Wholesale Bespoke Tailoring Trade Board (Eighth Minutes, April 27th, 1921):—

That, in view of the attempts now being made to bring about the abolition of Trade Boards, the members of the Board, of whom the majority have had many years' experience of the working of Trade Boards, place on record their opinion that the establishment of a Trade Board has been of considerable advantage to the Ready-Made and Wholesale Bespoke Section of the Tailoring Trade, notwithstanding certain administrative difficulties, towards the removal of which steps are now being taken; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister. Similar resolutions have been passed by the following Boards: Wholesale Mantle and Costume; Dressmaking and Women's Light Clothing; Brush and Broom; Shirt-making; Paper Bag.

It should be noted that these clothing boards, particularly dressmaking, are the very trades from which, if we are to believe the trade papers of the employers, unanimous disapproval of the Trade Board is expressed.

MINISTRY TO BLAME.—With regard to the second set of employers, there is no doubt that the policy of the Ministry of Labour in interfering with the autonomy of the Trade Boards and disregarding their advice on important questions, such as scope, has irritated large numbers of well-disposed employers, but if the Ministry of Labour would carry out the recommendations of the Committee already referred to, there is every hope that these causes of irritation will be removed.

EMPLOYERS' OBJECTIONS ANALYSED.—With regard to the third section, the opposition certainly appears at the first glance to be very formidable. A consideration of such organs as *The Drapers' Record* reveals a series of articles, letters and resolutions maintaining that Trade Boards already established are killing trade, and that the distributive trades would suffer the same fate if the promised Boards were set up. These opinions appear again in the general Press in the form of articles, letters, resolutions of Chambers of Commerce, etc., but if this volume of objections is analysed, the following points will emerge:—

INDIVIDUAL OBJECTORS.

The objections are not based on experience. Individual objectors are scarcely ever members of any Trade Boards, and in most cases represent the drapery or grocery section of the distributive trades. In this case, it should be noted that in the drapery trade, the promised Board has not been set up at all, while in the grocery trade, though the Board has been set up, no rates have been fixed owing to the practice of the Minister of Labour in referring the rates back to the Board on every occasion.

NOT CAUSES OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

The argument that unemployment is caused by the Trade Boards cannot be substantiated. The Boards do not fix an arbitrary rate of wages without consideration; they consider fully the circumstances of the case, and fix a rate accordingly, and whatever the industrial situation may be at the moment, there must be some rate which is the right one. Secondly, it cannot be proved that unemployment is greater in trades covered by Trade Boards than in other trades. Instances can be found of trades without a Trade Board with a percentage of unemployment of over 20 per cent., and of trades covered by Trade Boards with as low a percentage as 7 per cent.

"INTERFERENCE."

The arguments advanced against Trade Boards on the ground of interference are entirely contradictory, since the employers argue in one breath that a national minimum wage would be all right, and yet that the trade must fix its own conditions without interference.

BACK TO OLD WAGES.

It is stated in many of the objections that Trade Boards are unnecessary, and that even without the Trade Board interference the workers will never return to their former rates of wages. Unfortunately, the facts do not bear out this statement. There are many instances which show that not only have some workers returned to their former rates of pay, but that they are receiving wages lower in real value than their former rates of pay.

An instance of the need for Trade Boards is provided by the Catering Trade. The following is a schedule showing some instances of the wages prevailing:—

	North-East Coast.	Aver. Wage per week.	Amount of Food.
Newcastle-on-Tyne ...	4/- p.w. to hrs. daily		
	5/- " 11 " "		
	8/- " 10 " "		
	7/- " 10 " "		
Sunderland ...	10/- " 11 " "		
	(Work on Suns.) 8/- " 12 " "		
	10/- " 12 " "		

At the Co-operative Café, Newcastle-on-Tyne, the women receive 35/- per week for a 44-hour week and at another firm, 28/- per week of 48 hours, with two meals.

Most of the women in the cafés complain about the food as not being very good, and in some cases very bad indeed. The number of hours quoted is the actual number of hours the women are in the café because, although they are generally supposed to have fixed meal hours, when the café is busy they always are expected to leave their meals and to work.

EXAMPLES OF SWEATING.

Sheffield. One firm:—

- 17 Waitresses: 17/6; no commission.
- 6 Serving-maids: 17/2, 15/-, 14/-, 13/6, 11/6 and 10/6.
- 1 Cook and Carver: 21/6.
- 5 Veg., Fish and Pastry Cooks: 16/6.
- 2 Kitchen-maids: 16/6.

LABOUR'S POLICY.

The following resolution was passed at the 1921 Conference of the Labour Party:—

This Conference emphatically condemns the organised opposition of employers to Trade Boards, and the ineptitude of the Government in the matter. It views with grave concern the reactionary attitude of the Government, in contrast to the arguments used when the Amending Act was introduced in 1918. Believing that the establishment of Trade Boards is absolutely necessary in order to prevent exploitation (especially of women and children), this Conference urges the immediate setting up of Trade Boards to cover all trades not yet dealt with, and where it is deemed essential that protection of this kind should be afforded the workers.

WASHINGTON CONVENTIONS.

The Government's Record.

CONVENTIONS ADOPTED.—The Washington Conference of the International Labour Organisation (Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles) met in October, 1919. The following conventions were adopted:—

- (1) Limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week.
- (2) Concerning the establishment of free public unemployment agencies and the communication to the International Labour Office of all available information on measures taken to combat unemployment.
- (3) Fixing the period of rest for women (employed in industrial or commercial undertakings) before and after childbirth at six weeks' rest before (optional) and six weeks after childbirth (compulsory), together with a full and healthy maintenance grant throughout the period.
- (4) Prohibiting the employment of women during the night between the hours of 10 p.m. and 5 a.m.
- (5) Fixing the minimum age for admission of children to industrial employment at 14 years.
- (6) Prohibiting the employment of young persons under 18 years during the night in industrial undertakings, except in the cases of five scheduled continuous processes when young persons over the age of 16 years may be employed.

THE GOVERNMENT'S FAILURE.—Under the Treaty (Article 405) each country undertakes to submit all conventions adopted within one year (or in exceptional circumstances, 18 months) to the competent authority for the enactment of legislation or other action. Consequently these conventions should have been submitted separately for discussion on their individual merits to Parliament not later than July 27th, 1921. *This has not been done.* The debates arising out of the Convention took place on March 22nd, May 27th, and July 1st, 1921.

RATIFICATION.—Convention 2 has been formally ratified. No legislative change required. Conventions 4, 5, and 6 have also been ratified, and legislation adopted under the Women, Young Persons and Children (Employment) Act, 1920. Most of the provisions of these three conventions were already established under the Factory Act, but had been suspended during the war. Very little modification of the existing legislation was required. Conventions 1 and 3 have been neither ratified nor submitted to Parliament.

EXCUSES FOR VIOLATION.

Eight-hours Day.—On May 27th, Mr. George N. Barnes introduced a motion that the Conventions be submitted to Parliament as the proper authority. This was lost by 109 votes to 69.

Mr. Barnes was sent to Washington as one of the Government delegates, and stated that not only was the Government committed to the Eight Hours legislation by its own Bill of 1919, but that they had cabled him instructions at Washington saying:

In the view of His Majesty's Government, this principle should be adopted without qualification.

Dr. Macnamara (Minister of Labour) moved an amendment that it was not expedient to give effect to the hours of labour convention, saying that there were difficulties in

applying these provisions—the most serious being the present agreement between the railwaymen and their employers.

Sir Montague Barlow (Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, Government delegate to the Second and Third International Labour Conferences, and substitute for Sir Malcolm Delevingne as British Government representative on the Governing Body of the I.L.O.) as recently as November last, at the Geneva Conference, in defending the refusal of the British Government to ratify the Eight-hour Day Convention, said: "With regard to this matter of 48 hours, though we have not actually ratified the Convention, we have got the facts"; and, further, that over 11 million workers already had the 48-hour week.

Most of the industries enjoying the 48-hour week have secured this by means of collective agreements. These can be discarded at any time, whereas the ratification of the Convention would have been binding. Moreover, determined efforts are being made daily to increase the working hours, as well as reduce wages. More than 3,000,000 workers employed in industry have not yet achieved the eight-hour day, most of these being those most poorly-paid and poorly-organised. The ratification of the Convention would have been of immense advantage to them.

Sir Montague also spoke of the insuperable difficulties in the way of ratification. The Labour Party recognises no insuperable obstacle.

This view is shared by M. Albert Thomas, Director of the International Labour Office, who stated in his report at Geneva, that he had examined the special difficulties of the British Government, and that, had they consulted the International Labour Office, a solution could very easily have been found.

The Labour Party similarly had a solution ready.

Sir Gordon Hewart (Attorney-General) said in the debate on May 27th that "the authority for the ratification of conventions is the Crown," and later put in an alternative plea that they had been submitted to Parliament in the form of a White Paper.

The final ratification, i.e., the *communication of action taken* to the League of Nations, must be sent by the Government, but the decision on *action to be taken*, i.e., legislative changes, etc., is the prerogative of Parliament.

As to the White Paper, a printed list of the conventions adopted was circulated to the Members of Parliament, but the Conventions have never been submitted separately for discussion on their merits, nor has Parliament been consulted as to action taken.

This involves a definite violation of Article 405 of the Treaty.

Maternity Convention.—The Government offers two excuses for its refusal to ratify the Maternity Convention.

(1) That their representatives had not voted for it in Washington, and that, therefore, there was no obligation upon them to ratify.

(2) That the present maternity benefits under the Insurance Acts and the Maternity and Infant Welfare Act provide a greater protection than the Convention.

(1) Each Government is bound to submit all Conventions adopted by a two-thirds majority to the legislative assemblies, who will decide whether or not the Convention is to be ratified and translated into legislation. This obligation is unaffected by the votes cast by an individual country, and is binding on every country, whether they have voted for or against the Convention.

(2) The present protection offered to industrially-employed women is in no sense comparable to that provided for by the Convention. Existing legislation offers four weeks rest

The Speakers' Handbook

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE?—The Government has been asked repeatedly what it proposes to do about the Report, which was issued in July, 1920.

The reply has invariably been that it was proposed to introduce a non-controversial Bill. What this means may be imagined, but so far not even so much has been done. It is an important matter for thousands of workers. The Geddes Committee, meanwhile, has advised that Court fees should be imposed before the award; at present no fees are exacted up to the time of the award, and with good reason—many workers would be debarred from pressing their claim if the expense of litigation had to be borne. Not all cases are fought by Trade Unions, and in any case there is no warrant for making it more difficult for an injured worker to obtain redress.

WHAT LABOUR DEMANDS.—Payment of compensation from the first day of the accident.

Benefit to be at least full wages for total incapacity. Removal of all restrictions in connection with giving notice.

All accidents arising in the course of employment to be included.

Employers to be compelled to insure.

No salary limit to be fixed above which no compensation can be claimed.

STATISTICS.—Workers within the scope of the Act number 15,000,000. Sixty-five Joint Stock Insurance Companies do Workmen's Compensation business with employers having wage-roll exceeding £600,000,000 per year. Annual Premium Income in this respect is over £5,000,000. In addition there are fifty Mutual Associations which pay about £2,000,000 per year in compensation.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.—(Workmen's Compensation business.)

	Premiums.	Payments.
1914 ...	3,793,643 ...	1,805,304
1915 ...	3,725,349 ...	1,761,104
1916 ...	3,902,792 ...	1,714,181
1917 ...	4,309,315 ...	1,773,840
1918 ...	5,074,229 ...	1,925,156

UNINSURED EMPLOYERS.—Total number cannot be less than 250,000 (Gregory Report).

PERIOD OF COMPENSATION, 1912-13.—Percentage of cases terminated in which compensation lasted:—

	Less than 2 wks.	2-3 wks.	3-4 wks.	4-13 wks.	13-26 wks.	26 and over.
1912	8.52%	31.90%	18.97%	35.19%	3.80%	1.62%
1913	8.79%	33.83%	19.11%	33.36%	3.45%	1.46%

+FATAL ACCIDENTS.

Accidents.	Killed on Railways.	Killed in Mines.	Killed in all Industrial Accidents.	Killed by Industrial Diseases.
1915	488	1310	5895	67
1916	466	1321	6018	114
1917	381	1367	3355*	100

* Excluding Seamen.

NON-FATAL ACCIDENTS.—In 1913 there were 406,263 non-fatal accidents, of which 29,247 were on railways and 180,366 in mines or quarries.

The Labour Party has introduced a Bill into Parliament to remedy the present defects of the law.

+ Labour Year Book, 1918.

WAGES AND PROFITS.

Neither during the war nor since has there been any genuine "equality of sacrifice" as between the richer classes and the workers.

In the war men were conscripted and wealth was not: since the war Labour has made sacrifices and Capital has not. The main burden of the industrial slump has been borne by the workers, and Capital has largely escaped.

The contribution that Trade Unions have made, in the form of reduced wages, to bring down the cost of production and restart industry, compared with the contribution made by the employing and investing classes, in the shape of smaller profits, can be compared in the following figures:

THE WAGE SLUMP.—In 1921 the weekly wage bill of 7,100,000 workpeople was reduced (according to official records) by

£6,006,000 per week,

or considerably more than £312,000,000 for the year.

The total wage reductions were larger, and affected a greater number of workpeople than these figures indicate. Government employees, agricultural workers, shop assistants and clerks, domestic servants, and police are specifically excluded from the returns: and they have all suffered wage reductions.

The official returns relate to seven million workpeople, but there are over twelve millions covered by the State Insurance Acts, and as practically every grade and section of the workers have had to accept wage "cuts," the total number affected by the wage slump in 1921 is probably nearly sixteen millions.

THE WORKERS' LOSSES.—Over the whole field the weekly disbursement of wages to-day is estimated by *The Economist* (January 21 and February 18) to be from 25 to 33 per cent. less than a year ago.

The amount of the wage reductions has varied in different industries. The loss per head is:

In mining and quarrying, £2 per week.

Iron and steel trades, £1 19s. 7d. per week.

Building and allied trades, 13s. 6d. per week.

Textiles, 12s. 11d. per week.

Other industries, from 7s. 10d. to 12s. 3d. per week.

The following table shows the total net decrease in weekly wages and the number of workpeople affected during 1921 in the chief trades and services:

Trade	Number affected	Total decrease £
Building	450,000	304,000
Mining and quarrying	1,290,000	2,588,000
Iron and steel smelting	240,000	475,000
Engineering, shipbuilding, etc.	1,730,000	1,054,000
Textile	1,010,000	651,000
Clothing	230,000	48,000
Transport, excluding tramways	910,000	388,000
Paper, printing, etc.	200,000	54,000
Chemical, glass, brick, pottery...	280,000	139,000
Other trades	420,000	171,000
Public utility services	340,000	134,000
	7,100,000	£6,006,000

The Speakers' Handbook

THE LOSSES OF CAPITAL.—On the other hand, although the returns to Capital have likewise been decreasing the fall in profits has not been so great as the slump in wages.

Figures published in *The Economist* (January 14, 1922) show the profits made in 1921, as compared with the previous year, by a number of companies with an aggregate capital of over a thousand millions.

In 1921, the reports of 1,310 companies showed total net profits (after payment of debenture interest, etc.) of £112,036,083, as against £140,519,446 in 1920.

Thus, whilst the fall in wages in 1921 was from 25 to 33 per cent., the decrease in profits was just 20 per cent. in the same period.

Notwithstanding the slump, these companies not only managed to pay dividends on ordinary shares at the rate of over 7½ per cent. (as against 11 per cent. in 1920), but added to their reserves, though the amount thus disposed of was naturally not so large as in the prosperous years; over 21 millions of the year's profits of these companies were added to reserves. Dividends at the rate of over 5 per cent. were paid on preference shares; and interest on debentures at the rate of over 4 per cent.

Smaller returns to capital, reduced rates of dividends, and smaller additions to (in some cases withdrawals from) reserves are the measure of the sacrifices made by employers and investors; but neither relatively nor in a positive sense are they equivalent to the contribution made by the workers; a fall in income derived from investments is not to be compared with a drop in wages, which means for the workers a degradation of the standard of life.

WAGES STILL FALLING.—The downward trend of wages went on into the present year. In the first three months (January-March) a net reduction of £1,210,000 in the weekly wages of nearly 5,000,000 workpeople was recorded in the *Labour Gazette*.

The following table shows the amount of these decreases and the number of workers affected during this period, January-March, 1921:

Trade	Number affected	Decrease £
Building	487,000	55,700
Mining and quarrying	1,071,000	236,800
Iron and Steel Smelting	233,000	106,700
Engineering and shipbuilding	1,305,000	194,700
Other metal trades	313,000	59,700
Textile	446,000	70,900
Clothing	235,000	39,000
Transport	913,000	248,000
Paper, printing, etc.	164,000	15,000
Food, drink and tobacco	162,000	29,900
Public utility services	297,000	75,100
Other	311,000	78,500
	5,877,000	1,210,000

STRIKES AGAINST THE COMMUNITY.

"If the leaders of the Labour Party had told the truth to the Trade Unions in the months which followed the armistice, if they had told them that the man who laid aside his tools and refused to play his necessary individual part in the reconstruction of the industrial life of the nation was a traitor to the commonwealth we should not have lost, as we have lost, hundreds of thousands of working days in the last three years, and the whole financial position of the country to-day would have been at once a different and a more prosperous one."—LORD BIRKENHEAD (Savoy Hotel, 2/2/22).

The charge conveyed in the passage quoted above is one that has been persistently directed against the Trade Unions by the opposing parties.

It is untrue that the Trade Unions have obstructed the "reconstruction of the industrial life of the nation" by stoppages of work.

It is equally untrue that the stoppages which have occurred were "strikes against the community."

Wage changes involving tremendous reductions in the weekly earnings of millions of workpeople were brought about, without strikes, by agreement between employers and Trade Unions.

The comparatively small number of strikes which have taken place during the period of economic readjustment were not strikes against the community. They arose from the necessity of protecting the community from the rapacity of the exploiting class and of resisting unjust and unreasonable demands made by the employers upon the Trade Unions.

WAGE CHANGES BY AGREEMENT.—The Trade Unions did not resist reasonable and necessary wage adjustments when the industrial slump began. Five-sixths of the "cuts" carried into effect in 1921 were made without bringing about a stoppage of work.

The total amount of the "cuts" made in 1921 was over six millions per week.

Reductions totalling £3,000,000 were made under sliding scale agreements;

Reductions amounting to £1,700,000 were made as a result of negotiations between employers and representatives of the Trade Unions;

Reductions to the amount of £750,000 were made under "cost-of-living" sliding scales;

Reductions of about £250,000 were made under Trade Board orders, arbitration awards, etc.

It is estimated officially (*Labour Gazette*, January, 1922) that the wage reductions made during 1921 affected nearly 25 million workpeople—counting individuals as often as their wages were changed:

Less than 1,800,000 were affected by changes in wages following directly upon stoppages of work.

The disputes involving stoppages of work during 1921 led to a reduction of only £1,000,000 in wages: over £5,000,000 were taken off the weekly wages of several million workpeople without any sort of strike or stoppage of work.

REDUCTIONS WITHOUT STRIKES.—In January, 1922, over 3½ million workpeople suffered reductions in wages amounting to a total of over half a million a week.

Practically all the adjustments were made without a stoppage of work. Of the changes officially recorded (*Labour Gazette*, February),

- 2 cases, affecting 3,500 workers, were arranged by arbitration;
- 3 cases, affecting 17,500 workers, were settled by conciliation;
- 145 cases, affecting 2,158,000 workers, were dealt with under sliding scales.
- 186 cases were settled by direct negotiation or by Trade Board orders.

Only in six cases did the reductions give rise to disputes leading to a stoppage of work, and in these six cases less than 1,000 workers were involved.

FACTS ABOUT STRIKES.—Facts refute the charge that the Trade Unions indulged in wanton strikes against the interests of the community.

They also refute the allegation that stoppages of work have obstructed industrial reconstruction. The industrial slump began in 1921. In the "boom" period immediately preceding, employers were too busily engaged in taking profits to concern themselves about reconstruction; they began to "place industry on an economic basis"—their euphemism for attacking the wage standards of the workers—in 1921; but notwithstanding the provocation of such attacks, there were fewer stoppages in 1921 than in previous years.

Trade disputes were admittedly more numerous in the three years following the armistice than in even the period of great industrial unrest before the war (1911-13). The figures are:

	No. of disputes.	Workers involved.	Working days lost.
1918 ...	1,300 ...	1,142,000 ...	6,332,000
1919 ...	1,413 ...	2,575,000 ...	34,903,000
1920 ...	1,715 ...	1,937,000 ...	27,111,000

In 1921, though there were fewer disputes, the number of workers involved was almost equally large, and the number of working days lost was enormously greater.

	No. of disputes.	Workers involved.	Working days lost.
1921 ...	800 ...	1,773,000 ...	86,000,000

(Over 70,000,000 working days were lost as a consequence of one dispute in 1921, namely, the mining lock-out, which involved over 1,100,000 workpeople, and lasted 13 weeks).

WHY STRIKES OCCURRED.—Two causes produced the unusually large number of stoppages in the three years, 1918-20.

- (1) The continued rise in the cost of living.
- (2) The refusal of the employers to share the extraordinarily high profits they were making during the "boom" period.

During this period there was a sharp and uninterrupted rise in the cost of living. In July, 1919, it stood at 110 per cent. above the pre-war level, and in November, 1920, it had reached 176 per cent.

EMPLOYERS' PROFITS.—Wages followed the upward movement of prices very tardily and reluctantly, and the Trade Unions had to fight hard to obtain the increases which brought the workers' standard of life into some correspondence with the enhanced cost of living. Only in a few industries, and for a limited period, did wages reach and pass the level of prices; for the most part they lagged behind prices throughout the years in which both were rising.

Profits also rose, but the employers did not share their increased prosperity, except under pressure from the Trade Unions. It is estimated that there was an increase in companies' profits of 221 per cent. in 1918-19, as compared with 1913-14. Employers resisted the demand of the workers that out of their inflated profits wages should be brought into closer relation to the cost of living, and many stoppages resulted.

When it is asserted that the workers were not justified in stopping work, it might be asked whether the employers were justified in resisting the worker's claim for a share of the increased prosperity of industry—particularly when owing to the rise in prices the purchasing power of wages was falling.

The behaviour of the employers in the "boom years," when stoppages of work were necessary to force wages up, is sharply contrasted with the conduct of the workers during the trade depression, when wages were brought to lower levels in every industry without any serious stoppage, except the one in the mining industry in the spring of 1921.

Every advance in wages when prices rose had to be wrung from the employers, but Labour adopted a more reasonable attitude when wages were being adjusted to a falling cost of living; it fought only when the employers sought to lower wages unfairly and abruptly.

CAUSES OF UNREST.—That the question of profits was one of the root causes of the unrest leading to stoppages of work was asserted as early as 1915 by Lord Askwith speaking with the authority of his position as Industrial Commissioner and Chairman of the Committee on Production.

He stated this point strongly in a "Note on Labour Unrest," which he sent on February 24, 1915, to the Government. The document has never been published, although its publication was repeatedly urged by Lord Askwith and the Committee on Production.

In the memorandum Lord Askwith stated the view of his committee that unless something were done to curtail the large profits employers were making the workers would demand higher wages, but would reduce their claims if they could be satisfied that profits would be limited.

IMPORTANT STOPPAGES.

The history of the large-scale stoppages that took place after the armistice disproves the charge that the workers made unreasonable and extortionate demands without consideration for the community.

RAILWAY STRIKE, 1919.—In this dispute, which lasted about 10 days the railwaymen were concerned to bring wages into relation with the increased cost of living, to standardise wages, and to set up effective machinery for the determination of wage changes.

The resulting settlement showed that the railwaymen were justified in their demands. Wages were stabilised at their existing level for a stated period, and were then to be adjusted as prices fell; for every fall or rise of five points in the cost-of-living index number wages were to be reduced or increased by 1s., the adjustments being made by the Central Wages Board which with other machinery was set up under the settlement. At the same time permanent standard wage rates were established representing an increase of about 100 per cent. on the average pre-war rates.

A strike was necessary to secure these concessions;

The concessions made showed that the workers' claim was just.

As to the charge that the Trade Union leaders tamely declined to act during this crisis, it is enough to recall the activities of the 14 industrial and political leaders, who

were appointed by the Trade Unions involved in the stoppage, along with the Railway Unions, as a Mediation Committee. Their influence was used throughout the dispute to prevent a deadlock between the Railway Unions and the Government. They negotiated for both parties when neither would negotiate with the other. Their action materially shortened the duration of the strike, and brought about a satisfactory settlement which the Government and the Press acclaimed as just.

* * * * *

COTTON LOCK-OUT, 1921.—The total of working days lost since the armistice was swollen in 1921 by a lock-out of 500,000 cotton operatives from June 4 to June 15. These workers were locked out for refusing to accept a reduction of 95 points on the war bonus.

That they were justified in resisting that "cut" is proved by the fact that the employers modified their demands. The agreement reached on June 15 resulted in an immediate "cut" of 60 points, with the prospect of a further reduction of 10 points six months later.

In this case the employers, not the workers, caused the stoppage by making unwarrantable claims.

MINERS' LOCK-OUT, 1921.—The 13 weeks' stoppage in the mining industry in the spring of 1921 was a "strike against the community" on the part of the coalowners.

They seized the opportunity presented by the decision of the Government to decontrol the mining industry five months earlier than the date fixed by Parliament, to present a demand for wage reductions universally condemned as unreasonable and unjust. The coalowners' demands were not only denounced as excessive, but were generally admitted to be unfair in their incidence as between districts.

That the owners were not justified in forcing a stoppage, and that the miners were warranted in resisting the demand, is proved by the fact that the settlement involved a scale of reduction by smaller amounts and easier stages than the coalowners sought to impose. And the Government recognised the justice of the miners' case to the extent of offering £10,000,000 to ease the fall in wages and assist the poorer districts.

There was an earlier dispute in the mining industry, caused by a refusal of the coalowners either to reduce the price of coal to the domestic consumer, or to increase wages when profits were abnormally high. In trying to enforce a reduction of coal prices the miners were acting in the interests of the community, whilst the coalowners, with the connivance of the Government, were plundering it.

The policy of the miners in relation to profits, prices, and wages was defined by Robert Smillie, then president of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, early in the war, when he offered on their behalf to forego all claims to increased wages if the Government would keep food prices down. Neither the Government nor the coalowners at any time showed an equal public spirit in their dealings with the miners.

INDUSTRIAL COURTS ACT, 1919.—In introducing this measure on November 6, 1919, Sir Robert Horne, then Minister of Labour, said:

Everybody has felt the need, in cases where grave disputes have arisen, of some method by which an inquiry could be taken up which should enlighten the whole of the public upon the issues at stake.

The opportunity to apply the machinery of the Industrial Courts Act was given to the Government in the engineering trades' dispute, which led to the lock-out of the members of the Amalgamated Engineering Union on March 11, 1922.

Up to that date the Act had never been applied in a

national stoppage, but only to one or two minor disputes.

Under Part II. of the Industrial Courts Act the Minister of Labour has power, "where any trade dispute exists or is apprehended," to inquire into the causes and circumstances of the dispute,

and, if he thinks fit, refer any matters appearing to him to be connected with or relative to the dispute to a Court of Inquiry appointed by him for the purpose of such reference, and the Court shall, either in public or private at their discretion, inquire into the matters referred to them and report to the Minister.

The Act also provided that the Court of Inquiry might, if it thought fit, make interim reports, and its reports were as soon as possible to be laid before Parliament.

Repeated requests were made by representatives of Labour to set this machinery of the Act in motion for the purpose of inquiring into the "causes and circumstances" of the engineering trades' dispute.

GOVERNMENT REFUSES INQUIRY.—The Government evaded this request. No Court of Inquiry was set up. The part of the Act relating to such powers of inquiry was avowedly enacted in the interests of the public. The public interest was necessarily involved in a dispute affecting directly 300,000 engineering workmen, and threatening to bring in hundreds of thousands of other workpeople in allied trades. It was clearly in the public interest that a searching inquiry should have been made.

But the Minister of Labour, when the request for a Court of Inquiry was made, sheltered himself behind the plea that he could not bring the machinery of the Act into motion whilst the Unions concerned in the dispute, other than the A.E.U., were taking a ballot of their members on the question at issue.

The plea was disingenuous, for, as was pointed out in the debate in the House of Commons on March 20, 1922, nearly a fortnight after the lock-out notices took effect against the A.E.U., the Minister of Labour was asked to operate the Act *before the ballot of the other Unions was taken, before even it was framed.*

WHY INQUIRY WAS REFUSED.—The only convincing explanation of the Government's refusal to apply the provisions of the Industrial Courts Act in this dispute is that put forward by the chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party (Mr. J. R. Clynes) in the course of the debate:

I can tell my Rt. Hon. Friend that, outside these walls, there is a feeling that if the position had been reversed, if a condition of trade prosperity and boom had permitted the workers to make demands, and suddenly press new claims, all the resources of the law would have been used to prevent a stoppage and compel the two parties to take part in an inquiry. Precious time has already been lost by the Government owing to the fact that it has not already used the machinery at its disposal.

Not until the obstinacy of the employers in insisting upon the Associated Unions other than the A.E.U. accepting their demands regarding "managerial rights" rendered abortive the efforts of the mediators representing the National Joint Council of Labour, and added 600,000 more workers to those already locked out, did the Minister of Labour appoint a Court of Inquiry. The lock-out of the A.E.U. members had then lasted eleven weeks, and on the very day the Court opened the notices against the members of the 47 Unions, other than the A.E.U. were carried into effect by the Engineering and National Employers' Federations.

TRADE UNIONS.

1800.

One of the first Acts of the Imperial Parliament will be for the prevention of conspiracies among journeymen tradesmen to raise their wages. All benefit clubs and societies are to be immediately suppressed.

—*The Times*, Jan. 7, 1800.

1922.

The alienation of the funds of industrial societies to political purposes, and the abuse of Trade Unionism for political ends, constitute one of the most monstrous frauds ever practised upon British workmen.

—*Morning Post*, March 29, 1922.

"Working men of England, one word of warning yet. I doubt if you know the bitterness of hatred against freedom and progress that lies at the hearts of a certain part of the richer classes in this country. Their newspapers veil it in a kind of decent language; but you need not hear them talking among themselves, as I have often, and I know not whether scorn or anger would prevail in you at their folly and insolence. These men cannot speak of your order, of its aims, of its leaders, without a sneer or an insult; these men if they had the power (may England perish rather) would thwart your just inspiration, would silence you, would deliver you bound hand and foot for ever to irresponsible capital."—*William Morris*, May, 1877.

"If I were a working man I should never say that I would surrender my right in combination with others to take such steps as are legal and moral for the advancement of my interests, and the interests of those who worked with me."—*John Bright* in 1860.

"There is a growing feeling that a considerable section of organised labour is trying to tyrannise over the whole public, and to bully them into submission, not by argument, not by recognised political measures, but by brute force."—*Winston S. Churchill*, M.P., in 1920.

ATTACKS ON TRADE UNIONISM.—Hostility to the Trade Unions has persisted for over a century, though the character of the attacks made upon them has changed.

In its earliest stages the Trade Union movement had to face the bitter and determined opposition of those who denied the right of the workers to combine, and who used every political, legal, and economic weapon against their organisations.

The Unions had to fight hard to establish their right to exist.

They had to fight hard to obtain legal protection for their funds.

They had also to fight for the right to expend their funds on the objects they desired.

For over a century the struggle has gone on, and even yet the Trade Unions are the object of attacks inspired by the same motives of class hostility and fear.

LABOUR'S BIG BATTALIONS.—One method of attack adopted by the reactionary assailants of Trade Unionism is to deny its representative character.

Have the Trade Unions the right to speak on behalf of the working classes? These are the facts:

More than half of the total number of people engaged in industry are Trade Unionists.

The number of Trade Unionists in this country has steadily increased year by year, and now totals over 8,000,000.

The number of Trade Unionists in the United Kingdom has trebled since 1910 and doubled since 1914.

In 1910 there were about two and a half millions, and in 1914 about four millions: there are now over eight millions, organised in about 1,300 Unions.

The following table shows the total strength of Trade Unionism in various industries:

	1914	1919
Building	238,000	437,000
Mining and Quarrying	863,000	1,069,000
Metal, engineering, & shipbuilding	563,000	1,074,000
Textiles:		
Cotton	361,000	442,000
Other textiles	84,000	264,000
Cleaning, dyeing, finishing, etc.	55,000	104,000
Clothing:		
Boot and shoe	56,000	107,000
Tailoring and other clothing ...	47,000	156,000
Transport (land and water):		
Railways	337,000	624,000
Other transport	318,000	568,000
Agriculture and fishing	38,000	203,000
Paper, printing, etc.	93,000	192,000
Wood working and furnishing ...	64,000	125,000
Pottery, chemicals, etc.	22,000	65,000
Food, drink, and tobacco	32,000	63,000
Teachers	126,000	183,000
Shop assistants, clerks, etc.	106,000	267,000
Miscellaneous	95,000	260,000
General Labour	432,000	1,491,000
Employees of public authorities ...	244,000	390,000
Total	4,176,000	8,624,000

TOTALS OF EMPLOYED PERSONS.—Figures showing the number of persons employed in British industries are not available for a later date than 1914. In that year the following were the estimated totals of employed persons in the various industries specified in Table I.:

	Males.	Females.
Building	920,000	7,000
Mining and Quarrying	1,266,000	7,000
Metal industries	1,634,000	170,000
Textile industries	625,000	863,000
Clothing industries	287,000	612,000
Transport (railways)	660,000	12,000
Other transport	444,000	5,000
Agriculture (permanent)	800,000	80,000
Paper and printing	261,000	147,000
Wood industries	258,000	44,000
Chemical industries	159,000	40,000
Food, Drink, Tobacco	260,000	196,000
Employees of public authorities (including teachers) ...	496,000	198,000

Comparison of the two tables will show the extent of Trade Union organisation in the various trades and industries, and the grounds upon which the Unions claim the right to represent the interests of the whole body of workers therein.

THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

The charge that the Trade Unions do not represent the working people is usually directed in particular against the Trade Union Congress.

More than three-fourths of the total membership of the Trade Union movement is concentrated in the Trade Union Congress.

Over a period of fifty years—from 1871 to 1921—the records of the Trade Union Congress show a continuous increase in its affiliated membership. In 1921 for the first time a decreased membership of 87,572 was reported as a result of the abnormal trade depression and slump in employment. The following table shows the growth of the Trade Union Congress throughout the period of the war, and the difficult years following:

	No. of Unions.	No. of Members.
1912	127	1,987,354
1913	135	2,217,836
1914	190	2,866,077
1915	192	2,677,357
1916	227	2,850,547
1917	235	3,082,352
1918	262	4,532,085
1919	266	5,283,676
1920	215	6,505,482

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL'S ADMISSION

"How many political Flibbertigibbets there are running up and down the land calling themselves the people of Great Britain and the Social Democracy, and the masses of the nation! But I am inclined to think, so far as any body of organised opinion can claim the right to speak for this immense portion of the human race, it is the Trade Unions that more than any other organisation must be considered the responsible and deputed representatives of Labour. They are the most highly organised part of Labour; they are the most responsible part; they are from day to day in contact with reality. They are not mere visionaries or dreamers weaving airy Utopias out of tobacco smoke."

—At Glasgow, October 11, 1906.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNIONISM.—The growth of British Trade Unionism has been paralleled in other countries. Labour is a commanding force in the world.

In the 30 chief countries of the world, the total number of Trade Unionists has risen from about 16,000,000 in 1913 to over 42,000,000 in 1919.

Statistics are not complete for 1920, as returns are lacking from eight or nine of the 30 countries; but assuming that in these eight or nine countries the membership in 1920 was no more than in 1919, the total strength of Trade Unionism in the world in 1920 is estimated to be at least 48,000,000, or treble the pre-war membership.

Of the total of 42,000,000 in 1919, over 34,000,000, or 80 per cent., belonged to the European Trade Union movement. Six of the remaining 8,000,000 were in the Trade Unions of North America.

Trade Unions.

The strength of the Trade Unions in the leading countries arranged according to their totals for 1913 and 1920 is as follows:

	1913	1920
Germany	4,513,000 ...	13,000,000
United Kingdom	4,173,000 ...	8,024,000
Russia	— * ..	5,220,000
United States	2,722,000 ...	5,179,000
France	1,027,000 ...	2,500,000
Italy	972,000 ...	3,100,000
Czecho-Slovakia	— * ..	2,000,000
Australia	498,000 ...	684,000
Austria	260,000 ...	830,000
Belgium	200,000 ...	920,000
Netherlands	189,000 ...	683,000
Canada	176,000 ...	374,000
Japan	— ...	247,000
Denmark	152,000 ...	400,000
Sweden	136,000 ...	400,000
Spain	— * ..	876,000
India	— ...	500,000
Hungary	115,000 ...	343,000
Poland	— ...	947,000

*No figures available.

TRADE UNION FINANCES.

Expenses of Management.

VIRULENT ATTACKS.—Towards the end of 1921 specially prepared attacks on Trade Union management and finance appeared in the *Morning Post*, and have since been carried into the political field and pressed with virulence in constituencies where Trade Union representatives stand as Labour candidates. Pamphlets have been provided in large quantities for the use of election agents belonging to the orthodox parties and, with the help of employers, have been circulated amongst workpeople who have been unable to obtain out-of-work payments from their Trade Unions because funds have been depleted during the economic slump.*

THE CHARGE.—The object of these attacks, sustained by misleading statements and figures, is to suggest that after enjoying great prosperity from 1914 to 1920, the Trade Unions indulged in a series of political revolutionary strikes, and dissipated their funds by mismanagement and gross extravagance, or by wrongfully diverting them to political purposes. It is asserted that the law has been defied by some Trade Union officials and evaded by others in the administration of their funds.

Another assertion is that there has been a great deal of slackness in the official oversight of the Trade Unions provided for by law, the effect of which has been to connive at the illegal disposal of Trade Union funds. It is also asserted there are defects in Trade Union legislation which call for further legal enactments of restrictive character.

THE REPLY.—Much of the mischief results from the fact that the Registrar's returns, from which the *Morning Post* and other critics derived their figures, group under the heading, "Expenses of Management," all the general working expenses of each Trade Union. The only substantial items shown separately are those for friendly benefit payment, subscriptions to federations, legal expenses, and payment from the political funds of the Unions. By this means all the *working expenses* of the branches and district councils, as well as the ordinary working costs of headquarters, are lumped together in a way which gives the impression that the whole of the money has been dissipated in "management"—which is represented as mismanagement on the part of Union officials. The suggestion is that members cannot obtain unemployment pay because their money has been squandered. Such suggestions are untrue. They have only been promulgated for the purpose of damaging the moral and political credit of the Trade Unions and the Labour Party, and of creating bad feeling and confusion amongst their members.

What Expenses of Management Include.

It is absurd and unfair to charge as "Expenses of Management" such items as the following, which have hitherto all been grouped under that heading by the Registrar:

- (1) Providing printed matter, stationery, books, and forms for the use of branches, District Councils, and Union offices.
- (2) Rent of rooms for branch meetings and cost of advertising same.
- (3) Cost of clerical work and office accommodation.
- (4) Postage, telegrams, and carriage of parcels.
- (5) Auditors' fees and insurance premiums.
- (6) General organising and publicity work.

*It is estimated that over £10,000,000 has been paid in out-of-work benefit by the Unions during the last two years.

- (7) Cost of Conference and special meeting to consider employers' proposals, etc.
- (8) Expenses incurred during negotiations with employers' representatives or in arbitration proceedings.

In recent by-elections, hired speakers and canvassers employed against Labour candidates have gone so far as to suggest that Union officials have put into their own pockets the thousands of pounds misleadingly shown by the Registrar as "Expenses of Management."

Wherever this degree of misrepresentation takes place immediate measures should be instituted to identify the libellous slanderers and to secure corroborative evidence of their statements with a view to legal action being taken promptly.

NOT FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.—Trade Unions are not primarily Friendly Societies.

The functions of Trade Unions are to defend and improve the economic position of their members, to secure wage increases and changes in working conditions. In order to make progress with these primary and legitimate objects they have for many years found it necessary to engage in political action, which resulted, among other things, in the reversal of the Taff Vale judgment and the Osborne judgment, which paralysed the industrial activities of the Unions until the passing of the Trades Disputes Act in 1906 and the Trade Union Act in 1913. In these attacks differences in the rates of contribution are ignored. Comparisons are set up from aggregate income and expenditure figures which give the impression that the "Expenses of Management" in many of the largest Unions are exceedingly extravagant compared with the percentage of the same expenses incurred by some of the older Unions, which have much higher rates of subscription. The critics ignore the fact that many of the largest Unions have been compelled to work on low rates of contribution because their members are engaged on low-paid work, or are beginners in Trade Unionism, and cannot at present be induced to pay such high rates of contributions as the members of the older organisations of skilled craftsmen.

UNFAIR COMPARISONS.—The unfairness of the comparison can easily be proved by taking the case of a Union with a large membership of unskilled workers paying (say) 6d. per week, and another organisation of men who pay (say) 2s. per week each. If the general working expenses of the first Union cost 4d. per member per week, a total of 66.66 per cent. is shown by the critics to have been expended in "Expenses of Management." But in the case of the second Union, where the general expenditure also averages 4d. per member per week, the percentage figures come out at only 16.66 per cent.

Obviously, the Union with the low rate of subscription is bound to spend the bulk of its revenue in working expenses in carrying on its activities on behalf of its members, whilst the other Union can put a good percentage to reserve. Another misleading comparison is made by taking the expenditure of the Unions during 1920, which was necessarily far higher than in 1918, and suggesting that the increase is all due to extravagance and mismanagement. The explanation is that numbers of members and branches in all the Unions increased enormously during 1919 and 1920. The latter year was one of maximum activity in dealing with wage questions and other matters that had to be settled after the war. All this necessitated the holding of many more meetings than usual by the branches and district councils; or an abnormal number of general conferences to consider employers' proposals, etc.; and of other special gatherings connected with the enormous amount of working devolving on all the Unions in that year.

Further, throughout the war period the Unions observed the industrial truce agreed to by the National Movement

The Speakers' Handbook

when war came. Up to the end of 1918 they were working with staffs heavily depleted through enlistment, and necessarily their activities were kept down to the lowest minimum. Expenses were naturally lower in 1918 than in 1920. Most of the organisations had to increase their staffs in 1920. Salaries of the Unions' employees had to be raised to enable them to meet the enormous additional increase in the cost of living resulting from the increased profiteering permitted by the Government after the "outbreak of peace."

REGISTRAR'S RETURNS.—These virulent misrepresentations, dictated by political hostility, led the General Council of the Trade Unions Congress last March to take up the question of Trade Union returns with the Registrar of Friendly Societies. An interview with this official and his assistants on April 3 brought out the point that the method of grouping general working expenses under the heading of "Expenses of Management" was unsuitable in the case of Trade Union statistics, and was likely to create a wrong impression.

The Registrar agreed to alter the heading of the group of accounts items in question from "Management Expenses" to "General Working Expenses"; also to give details showing the amounts due respectively to (a) branches, (b) the district offices, and (c) the headquarters of each Union.

A TYPICAL CASE.—To give point to the foregoing the case of the Railway Clerks' Association may be cited. This organisation has been criticised—and its general secretary, Mr. A. G. Walkden, challenged in the Wolverhampton by-election last March—on the ground that the costs of management are excessive.

In the reply issued on behalf of the Association it is pointed out that the whole working expenses of the Union, including those of 19 Divisional Councils and over 500 branches, go under the "Expenses of Management" heading. These figures include the cost of all the items specified on page 80. The increase in expenditure between 1918 and 1920 is attributed to the fact that 1918 was a war year, when the Union was observing the industrial truce and normal activities were quiescent. In 1920, however, the R.C.A., having secured recognition, was engaged in national negotiations which involved the holding of numerous meetings throughout the country and several national conferences. In the total of this Union's expenses the cost of maintaining of full-time staff is quite a minor one. The general secretary's salary does not amount to 1d. per member per quarter. The cost of the rest of the staff, including district secretaries and clerks, is less than four-fifths of a penny per week out of the regular weekly subscription of 1s.

The value of the improved conditions secured by the R.C.A. for its members is twenty times the cost of the members' contributions.

EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS.—Criticism can also be answered by counter-criticism. It is legitimate to demand production of the accounts and balance sheets of the employers' organisations, which are legally regarded as Trade Unions. Employers' unions are practically secret societies which neither publish accounts nor hold public meetings. Behind closed doors they conspire to enrich themselves further by reducing the standard of living of their workpeople, and are notoriously active "behind the scenes" at Westminster in promoting their own "Trade Union objects" by Parliamentary action. They pay no friendly benefits to their individual members. All their money is spent in what the *Morning Post* would describe as "Expenses of Management" in the case of a Trade Union of workpeople.

TRADE UNIONS AND EX-SERVICE MEN.

The Facts of the Case.

Trade Union organisations have been charged with obstructing the re-employment of ex-Service men by maintaining unreasonable regulations and restrictions.

The facts are:—

That the trade unions have actively co-operated in the task of reabsorbing ex-Service men in industry.

That such regulations as the trade unions have insisted on maintaining have protected against the rapacity of the employers the ex-Service men as well as the general body of trade unionists.

DEMOBILISATION PROBLEMS.—Trade unions have been engaged upon the problems of demobilisation since 1916, and are still engaged upon them, in the interests of the ex-Service men. Representatives of the trade unions have served on

Advisory Wages Boards, created to deal with the question of wages to be paid to ex-Service men;

Trade Advisory Committees, created to assist the Minister of Labour in dealing with the problem of training disabled ex-Service men for employment in various industries;

Many Committees in conjunction with both Government departments and employers' associations engaged in formulating special training schemes for apprentices whose apprenticeship had been interrupted by war-service;

and in setting up under the Home Office special agreements covering the case of reinstated men in trades not dealt with in the Munitions Act.

UNEMPLOYED EX-SERVICE MEN.—At the time these attacks were being pressed most vigorously by Lord Methuen (in "The Times"), Mr. Lloyd George, Earl Haig, and a host of others, in the early months of 1920, over 1,500,000 ex-Service men were employed under the protection of the very regulations that unions were being assailed for insisting upon in the interest of all the workers.

This fact proves that the object of the attack was not to further the interests of unemployed ex-Service men but to undermine trade unionism. Further proof lies in the fact that when the employers, with the aid of the Government, attacked the trade unions from another angle, in the period of intensified unemployment, criticism of the obstructive policy of the trade unions in regard to unemployed ex-Service men suddenly ceased.

The latest official evidence respecting the re-employment of ex-Service men shows the position at the end of December, 1921. There were 29,469 employers under the national scheme whose undertakings covered

the re-employment of 367,165 ex-Service men;

whilst 2,844 local authorities, including county councils, borough councils, boards of guardians, etc., had adopted the scheme guaranteeing employment to a percentage of ex-Service men.

THE ENGINEERING TRADE.—Unemployment was already making the position of the workers in various industries very difficult at the moment when the trade unions in those industries were being charged with

obstructing the employment of ex-Service men. Thus, the unions in the engineering and metal trades were attacked for their opposition to the training of disabled men for these trades at the moment when

over 32,000 ex-Service men received unemployment pay as workers in the engineering and foundry trades. Obviously, if more ex-Service men had then been in training for employment in these trades the number of unemployed workers therein would have been increased.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union had at that time 24,000 members out of work, and several thousands of its members still in the army; and the entry of more men into the industry would necessarily have destroyed their chances of work, and imposed heavier burdens on the Union.

Altogether, there were actually 327,626 ex-Service men receiving unemployment pay registered at the Employment Exchanges as workers in the industries from which the unions were charged with excluding them.

THE BUILDING TRADES.—The unions in the building trades have been specially singled out for attack. The motive of the attack was to make the public believe the unions were responsible for the Government's failure to carry out its promised housing programme.

These Unions objected to dilution. They had their reasons. One reason was that at that time (early in 1920) there were

nearly 10,000 ex-Service men receiving unemployment pay as workers in the building trades.

There was said to be a shortage of labour in the building trades. But at the moment when the Prime Minister stated in Parliament (March, 1920) that the additional number of skilled workmen required on house-building was 5,500, there were actually over 13,000 ex-Service building trade workers on the "live" registers of the Employment Exchanges in the same month; nearly 10,000 of them were skilled workers.

Critics of the trade unions in the building trades talked of opposition to dilution, to excuse the Government's failure to build houses. The unions were defending the interests of all concerned in insisting that there should be no large influx of men into the building trades for whom employment could not be guaranteed. A large amount of unemployment has been a normal feature of the building trades for a great many years.

THE BRICKLAYERS' CASE.—There were 2,432 ex-Service men belonging to the bricklaying trade drawing unemployment pay at the time when the Bricklayers' Union was being attacked for opposing dilution. During that year the number of bricklayers returning to the trade was over 9,000.

The Union calculated that at least 20,000 bricklayers had left the trade between 1914 and 1919, because they could not get a livelihood.

The bulk of them could be got back into the trade if decent conditions were guaranteed. There was, therefore, no need to bring new men into the trade by any scheme of dilution.

THE CARPENTERS' CASE.—The Ministry of Health declared in 1920 it required 41,850 carpenters to carry out its scheme of building 200,000 houses.

The Amalgamated Union of Carpenters, Cabinet-makers and Joiners pointed out that there were 9,787 carpenters then at work on working-class houses. But there were 53,180 carpenters working on aerodromes, banks, hotels, cinemas, churches, castles, and private mansions. From that reservoir the carpenters needed could be drawn; "stop luxury building, as an alternative to dilution."

The Union also pointed out that as one carpenter could at the very least do eight houses in a year, 200,000 houses would call for 23,750 carpenters (not the 41,850, as estimated by the Ministry of Health). As there were already 9,787 carpenters engaged on working-class houses, the number to be withdrawn from "luxury building" was 13,973, leaving nearly 50,000 carpenters to carry on non-urgent work: so that no necessity for dilution existed even for that class of work.

There was no shortage of labour in the carpenters' branch of the building trades. No justification existed, therefore, for dilution among the carpenters, any more than among the bricklayers.

GUARANTEES ABOUT DILUTION.—The Government justified dilution on the ground that there was no fear of unemployment in the building trades for years to come.

The workers, knowing better, asked for guarantees against unemployment before they consented to dilution. These the Government refused to give.

In actual fact, the workers' fear of unemployment was justified by events within a few months of the Government's demand for dilution. The industrial slump came, the Government abandoned the housing programme of Dr. Addison, Minister of Health, and at the beginning of the present year

168,000 building trade workers were unemployed.

If dilution had been permitted when the Government required it, the position would, of course, have been to that extent worsened. It would have swollen the number of unemployed.

GOVERNMENT'S HOUSING FAILURE.—Dr. Addison, at a conference with the building trades unions in March, 1920, tried to get the unions to agree to dilution by saying that if the plan was adopted the Government would be able to build 200,000 houses a year.

There were even then 9,042 ex-Service men drawing unemployment pay as building trade workers.

And no guarantee was given that the Government would carry out its promise to build 200,000 houses.

As a matter of fact, their performance fell far short of their promise. The report of the Geddes Committee on economy gives the total of houses built, up to the beginning of this year, as 68,000. The number of houses started but not finished at that date was 60,000. And there were 38,000 houses contracted for, but not started.

Thus in two years the Government had not completed half the building programme promised for one year.

If the building trades unions had allowed themselves to be seduced by Dr. Addison's promises, and had admitted the number of men he claimed to be necessary to carry out his programme, the amount of unemployment in the building trades resulting from the general trade depression would have been increased by that resulting from the Government's failure to build as many houses as it had undertaken to do.

TRAINING SCHEMES.—These attacks on individual trade unions and on the trade union movement as a whole were made at a time when they were actively co-operating in the effort to establish training schemes for ex-Service men in industry.

This fact was admitted by the then Minister of Labour, Sir Robert Horne, in a speech in the House of Commons (February 18, 1920). He then stated:

I should like to express my gratitude to a very large number of trade unions for the help they have given me in instituting the systems of industrial training which

are now in vogue. Something like seventy Trade Unions have taken an active and zealous part in this great object. We have had months of deliberations and discussions as to the particular training schemes to be set up. They were all of vital importance to the men who were being trained and others in the occupations for which they were being trained. The schemes which had been instituted do a great deal of credit to the men who have applied their brains to working them out.

Through the co-operation of the trade unions the following results in the institution of training schemes for disabled ex-Service men have been secured (latest figures, up to January 3, 1922):

Total number of men trained	47,095
Men still in training	23,152
Men on approved waiting list	35,059

NUMBERS IN TRAINING.—The list of trades in which training schemes were in operation up to October, 1921, shows that the building trades, specially singled out by critics for abuse, had the largest number of disabled ex-Service men preparing to enter the industry:—

Trade.	No. in training.
Building	3,995
Tailoring	2,417
Furniture	2,171
Vehicle Building	1,760
Commercial	1,500
Engineering, General and Electrical	1,315
Gold, Silver, and Allied Trades	1,311
Motor Driving and Mechanics	1,243
Rural Handicrafts	995
Manual Instructors	972
Distributive Trades	800
Boot and Shoe	630
Other Trades	3,459

At the end of November, 1921, of the total number of men in training, 17 per cent. were being trained in the building trade, 11 per cent. in tailoring, 10 per cent. in the furniture trades, and 8 per cent. in vehicle building.

INTERRUPTED APPRENTICESHIPS.—Charges were made in Parliament that the Trade Unions were obstructing the reinstatement of ex-Service men whose periods of apprenticeship were interrupted by their war service.

On December 17, 1919, Sir H. Craik, M.P., asked the Minister of Labour—

Whether young men who, but for having joined the army during the war, would have been serving an apprenticeship and thus acquiring qualification as skilled labourers, are now, by the action of the trade unions, being prevented from receiving that training or being given any employment except as unskilled labourers.

The Minister of Labour (Sir Robert Horne) replied:—

If the Rt. Hon. gentleman is referring to the case of those who had begun apprenticeships prior to the war, there are, so far as I am aware, NO IMPEDIMENTS OFFERED BY ANY TRADE UNION to the training necessary for the completion of the apprenticeships.

This charge is refuted, not only by the Labour Minister's statement, but by the figures relating to interrupted apprenticeship schemes. Up to December 28, 1921, 44,391 apprentices were accepted for training.

under the special schemes set up with the co-operation of the trade unions, in agreement with the 17,779 employers who have agreed to work the schemes.

Of the accepted apprentices, 34,987 had completed their training at the end of December, 1921, and 9,604 were still in training.

LAND SETTLEMENT.—Supporters of the Coalition Government accuse the trade unions of having obstructed attempts to get ex-Service men resettled in industry. In one direction, at any rate, the Government was not impeded by trade union restrictions: in getting ex-Service men back to the land.

In its Manifesto on the eve of the 1918 General Election, the Government promised to put into operation plans that it had ready

to acquire land on simple and economical bases for men who had served in the war, either for cottages with gardens, allotments, or small-holdings as the applicants may desire;

and to provide grants to assist in training and in initial equipment of the ex-Service men returning to the land.

This was the promise. What was the Government's performance?

Up to the end of 1920, the number of ex-Service men who had applied for land for small-holdings was 43,847, and their wants could have been satisfied if 761,048 acres of land had been available. The Government promised that public authorities, "and if necessary the State itself," would acquire land for the purpose.

But at the end of two years it had found only 154,393 acres, and the number of men provided with holdings, including ex-Service men and civilians, was 10,729.

There was a "waiting list" of 15,564 ex-Service men who had been approved as applicants for holdings by the Ministry of Agriculture; and over 33,000 applicants awaiting approval—and the promised land.

AGRICULTURE AND THE COUNTRYSIDE.

Confessions and Promises.

THE MINIMUM WAGE.—We have come to the conclusion that the labourers cannot establish a minimum wage merely by the ordinary process of combination. . . . Therefore, we have decided that it is especially a case and a trade where the State ought to come in and see that the labourer does get a minimum wage.—Mr. LLOYD GEORGE, October 22, 1913.

LAND INQUIRY COMMITTEE—RECOMMENDATIONS:—

1. That in order to secure to the labourers a sufficient wage it is necessary to provide for the fixing of a legal minimum wage by means of some form of Wage Tribunal.
2. That it should be an instruction to such Wage Tribunal that immediately, or within a short and definite period the wage should be fixed at least at such a sum as will enable the labourer to keep himself and an average family in a state of physical efficiency and to pay a commercial rent for his cottage.
3. That it should be laid down as an essential feature of any legislation dealing with the minimum wage that a farmer who is able to prove that the rise in wages has put upon him an increased burden should have the right to apply to a judicial body as a Land Court for re-adjustment of his rent.

"A SCANDAL."—I think, speaking generally, the conditions under which the agricultural labourer has had to live, and the remuneration which he has received in the last three generations, has been a scandal and an injury to the best interests of agriculture. . . . I say to the farmers it is no good trying to fight against the increase of the agricultural labourers' wage to a point which will at any rate approximate to the wage which is paid to other men in rural industries alongside him. It is no good saying that the agricultural labourer must be a class apart and paid less than anyone else. He will not stand it, and there is no reason why he should stand it.—LORD LEE, Nov. 10, 1919.

AGRICULTURE AND LAND DEVELOPMENT.—

Scientific farming must be promoted, and the Government regard the maintenance of a satisfactory agricultural wage, the improvement of village life, and the development of rural industries as essential parts of an agricultural policy. Arrangements have been made whereby extensive afforestation and reclamation schemes may be entered upon without delay.—*Coalition Manifesto*—published November 21, 1918.

Agriculture is such a vital industry—it is, after all, the

greatest industry in this country—that it is quite impossible to make a survey of the trade and industry of the country and leave it out of the reckoning. I hope to submit to the agriculturists of this country on behalf of the Government schemes which will restore agriculture to the position it was in forty or fifty years ago, when there were four or five million more acres under cultivation than now, and will put us in the position which Germany was in—where Germany produced food on a hundred acres to feed seventy-five persons, whereas in the United Kingdom it feeds only forty persons.—(RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE, in *"The Future,"* September, 1919, p. 6.)

BROKEN PLEDGES.

AGRICULTURAL WAGES BOARD.—Established by Corn Production Act, 1917. Continued by Agriculture Act, 1920, on condition that it could be terminated at four years' notice by Government. Six months after this Act the Wages Board was scrapped by the Government and the Corn Production Act (Repeal) Act became law in July, 1921.

COALITION EXCUSES.

The chief excuse is "anti-waste." The Coalition argue that the country cannot pay the guaranteed prices for corn to farmers and, therefore, as part of the original bargain, the Wages Board had to go. This must mean that the Wages Board kept wages from falling and that the Coalition wanted them to fall if the farmers were to get less from the Government.

It does not follow that the Wages Board should have been abolished, because the Board could have adjusted wages to the new prices as Trade Boards can. Again, it does not follow that minimum wages should not be enforced even if prices led to a reduction of some wages.—(See pamphlet, *Farmworkers*—by George Dallas.)

RESULT OF ABOLITION OF WAGES BOARD.—

The possibility of a general stoppage of farm work in Norfolk has perturbed Sir A. Griffiths Boscawen (Minister of Agriculture). The trouble follows a decision of the organised farmers of the county to reduce the standard wage from 36s. to 30s. a week.

The Conciliation Committee failed to reach an agreement on the matter, and although a further meeting has been fixed for the middle of January the representatives of the Agricultural Workers' Union and the General Workers' Union declare that it is impossible to accept a wage which would bring the workers below the poverty line.—*Daily News*, Dec. 23, 1921.

EFFECT ON ALL WAGES.—There was a Committee of the Cabinet appointed to investigate the cause of labour trouble. We heard evidence of witnesses, employers and workmen who came before us, and I will tell you what struck us. How the wages in a good many industries are lowered and pulled down by the fact that the agricultural worker was underpaid. Railway labour we found was very much affected by the lower wages of the agricultural labourer. Dock labourers and builders' labourers; we found it entered into the question of wages in most of the

The Speakers' Handbook

trades that were in disturbance and unsettlement at the moment. We cannot deal with the agricultural labourer as though it were a problem of the land alone.—Mr. Lloyd GEORGE, Oct. 11, 1913.

TORY TRIBUTE TO LABOUR.

As soon as the Government saw that the bargain was likely to become operative—that is to say, expensive—they tore up the scrap of paper on which it was written. They had thrown a turnip through a shop window. Instead of standing their ground they ran away. They have lost credit with agriculturists—labourers as well as farmers—and left themselves without any agricultural policy for a substantial increase of home-grown food. Research and education are not, in themselves, enough. They are essential conditions of progress; but they afford no alternatives to the programme of the Labour Party for the reconstruction of the countryside.

The Government's abandonment of its policy leaves the Labour Party in sole possession of the field. They are the one section of the community which has put forward a definite programme "with regard to agriculture and rural life." At present they have no competitor.

This is the policy which at present holds the field unchallenged.—LORD ERNLE in *The Times*, December 19, 1921.

LABOUR POLICY.

National Policy for Agriculture.

"Increased production of foodstuffs by the employment of more British labour on better cultivated British land."

Abolition of Landlordism.

"... the substitution of public for private ownership in the land (subject to equitable treatment of each person whose property is required for the public good, and to a proper security of tenure for the home and the homestead), underlies, in principle, all its specific proposals."

Councils for Agriculture.

Authority should be local, not national.

Councils elected by farmers, farm labourers and one-third members to represent public interest.

Legal Minimum Wage.

"Wage sufficient for the full and healthy development of every agricultural labourer, and his family."

Restoration of the National Wages Board.

Housing.

More cottages—none of them "tied." To be built by local authority, with State grant.

Revision of Game Laws.

No hindrances to agriculture for the sake of sport.

Tenure.

Security of tenure for all occupiers of land.

Assessment and Rating.

The reform of assessment and rating so as to secure a relief of present burdens upon occupiers.

No Tariffs.

No protective tariff or other artificial raising of the cost of living.

For details on further points of policy, such as Workers' Control, Co-operation, etc., see the pamphlet, *The Labour Party and the Countryside* (The Labour Party, 33 Eccleston Square, S.W.1.).

Agriculture

WAGE REDUCTIONS.

RESULT OF ABOLITION OF WAGES BOARD.

RATES OF WEEKLY WAGES FOR WORKERS OF 21 YEARS AND OVER.

	Wages Board.		Conciliation Agreements.	
	Sept. 5, 1921		Mar. 22, 1922	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Cambridgeshire:				
Horsemen, etc.	51	6	40	6
Other Workers	42	0	31	0
Cheshire:				
Horsemen	51	0	36	0
Other Workers	47	0	36	0
Cumberland & Westmorland:				
Horsemen, etc.	56	0	45	0
Other Workers	42	0	32	6
Hertfordshire:				
All classes	42	0	31	3
Lincolnshire:				
All classes	42	6	31	3
Norfolk:				
Horsemen	42	0	36	0
Other Workers	42	0	30	0
Northumberland:				
Horsemen	54	6	32	0
Other Workers	44	6	32	0
Suffolk:				
Horsemen	42	0	36	2½
Other Workers	42	0	30	2½
Yorkshire—N. Riding:				
All classes	43	0	35	0
Yorkshire—W. Riding:				
All classes	43	0	36	0
Carnarvon:				
Horsemen	53	0	38	0
Other Workers	42	0	35	0
Glamorgan:				
All classes	44	0	34	0
Merioneth & Montgomery:				
Horsemen	48	0	36	0
Other Workers	42	0	33	0
Pembroke:				
All classes	42	0	34	0

Corn Production Act of 1917 repealed as from October 1, 1921.

Figures for Wages Board taken from *Wages Board Gazette* for September 1, 1921.

HOUSING.

Promises and Performance.

KING GEORGE V.—I am informed that the immediate need of working class houses for England and Wales alone is estimated at approximately 500,000. To meet this need, the same untiring energy and enthusiasm will be required as that which enabled the country to meet the demand for munitions of war. . . . It is not too much to say that an adequate solution of the housing question is the foundation of all social progress. Health and housing are indissolubly connected. If this country is to be the country which we desire to see it become, a great offensive must be undertaken against disease and crime, and the first point at which the attack must be delivered is the unhealthy, ugly, over-crowded houses in the mean street, which we all of us know too well.—*From a speech in April, 1919.*

COALITION MANIFESTO.— . . . One of the first tasks of the Government will be to deal on broad and comprehensive lines with the housing of the people, which during the war has fallen so sadly into arrears, and upon which the well-being of the nation so largely depends.

There is no doubt that our housing conditions in this country are a disgrace to the Empire. . . . In England and Wales alone there is a shortage of at least 400,000 houses.

THE PRIME MINISTER.—What is our task? To make Britain a fit country for heroes to live in. That is the first problem. One of the ways of dealing with that is, of course, to deal with the housing conditions. Slums are not fit homes for the men who have won this war, or for their children. They are not fit nurseries for the children who are to make an Imperial race, and there must be no patching up. This problem has got to be undertaken in a way never undertaken before, as a great national charge and duty. It is too much to leave it to municipalities merely. Some of them are crippled from the restricted income placed at their disposal. Some are crippled from the fact that they have crushing burdens of another character, and some are good, and some are not good. Therefore, the housing of the people must be a national concern.—*At Wolverhampton, November 22, 1918.*

Mr. WALTER LONG.—It would indeed be a crime—a black crime—if, reading as we do the wonderful accounts of the sufferings which our heroes have to undergo in the trenches . . . we sat still now and did nothing by way of preparation to ensure that when these men come home they shall be provided for with as little delay as possible. To let them come from the horrible water-logged trenches to something little better than a pigsty here would be indeed criminal on the part of ourselves, and would be a negation of all we have said during this war, that we can never repay these men for what they have done for us.—*Speaking in November, 1916, as President of the Local Government Board.*

SUMMARY OF FACTS:

The Local Authorities, 1919, estimated the need for houses in England and Wales as 800,000. The two years elapsed would add 200,000, so that in 1922 the number needed is 1,000,000. But nearly 200,000 have been built.

The need in 1922 is the same, 800,000, as in 1919, according to the Local Authorities.

The Coalition itself confessed in 1918 that 400,000 were needed, and as our building since then has not met the normal annual need for the three years, we still need the same 400,000 even on the Coalition admissions.

LABOUR POLICY.

The Labour Party policy is:—

To secure the building of houses by the Municipalities and the State in far larger numbers than ever before.

To replace the existing insanitary houses and unhealthy areas by well-built new houses.

To secure that the houses are of good quality and provide proper accommodation.

To maintain reasonable conditions of labour for the building trade operatives.

To encourage building by direct labour and through Building Guilds.

To ensure that the houses are let at reasonable rents.

To relieve the congested areas of large towns by building new towns, properly planned, with a belt of agricultural land surrounding them, where conditions of life will be healthy and economical.

THE NEED FOR HOUSES.

SCOTLAND.—The Report of the Royal Commission on Housing in Scotland, submitted to Parliament in 1917, contains (p. 346) the following:—

These are the broad results of our survey: unsatisfactory sites of houses and villages, insufficient supplies of water, unsatisfactory provision for drainage, grossly inadequate provision for the removal of refuse, widespread absence of decent sanitary conveniences, the persistence of the unspeakably filthy privy-midden in many of the mining areas, badly constructed, incurably damp labourers' cottages on farms, whole townships unsuitable for human occupation in the crofting counties and islands, primitive and casual provision for many of the seasonal workers, gross overcrowding and huddling of the sexes together in the congested industrial villages and towns, occupation of one-room houses by large families, groups of lightless and unventilated houses in the older burghs, clotted masses of slums in the great cities. To these add the special problems symbolised by the farmed-out houses, the model lodging-houses, congested backlands, and ancient closes.

Merely to relieve existing overcrowding, and replace houses that should be demolished, some 121,000 houses are required, and, if an improved standard is adopted, as we recommend, the total number of new houses required would approach 236,000. For such gigantic figures our Report submits full justification. On this point the Commission is unanimous.—*Report of the Royal Commission on Housing in Scotland (1917).*

Ayrshire.

Mining village, 227 houses. 116 two-roomed.
111 one-roomed.

only one ashpit, 50 per cent. of people no closets, no wash-houses, no coal houses; the coal stored under the bed.

Hamilton.

Population.	Area—approx.	In one or two-roomed houses.
38,000	300 acres	27,000
Pleasure grounds of Duke of Hamilton, 2,500 acres.		

Infant Mortality Rates in Lanarkshire.

Blantyre ...	143 per 1,000
Bothwell ...	146 „ „
Bellshill ...	156 „ „
Holytown ...	142 „ „

The great bulk of the cases of phthisis come from these houses, and the people, after being treated at the sanatoria, are sent back to the slums where the disease has been contracted.—Mr. JOHN ROBERTSON, M.P.

ENGLAND.—The Memorandum of the National Housing and Town Planning Council on the present housing situation gives county figures relative to the need of houses. The total gross need is put at 744,424. Lancashire needs 95,306 houses; Yorkshire, 119,440; Warwickshire, 79,260; Staffordshire, 46,212; Durham, 30,121; Northumberland, 22,034; Cheshire, 17,466.

WALES.—The total gross need of houses in the Welsh counties is 87,151. Glamorganshire requires 45,161 houses; Monmouthshire, 21,436; Denbighshire, 5,722; Carmarthenshire, 3,498; Flintshire, 2,439; Carnarvonshire (Mr. Lloyd George's county), 2,342.

HOUSING AND HEALTH.

The housing problem is two-fold in its relation to disease, namely the *insufficiency and unsuitability* of the house accommodation available. Insufficiency leads to overcrowding; unsuitability may be due to inadequate cubic capacity, absence of ventilation or insanitation. In the train of overcrowding, ill-ventilation or insanitation follows a mass of trouble, incapacity, disease and death.

There are, broadly speaking, three evils of bad housing:—

(a) *Impaired physique* leading to debility, fatigue, unfitness, and reduced powers of resistance. (b) *Sickness rates* are relatively high. (c) *General death rates* higher, expectation of life lower.

Tuberculosis and Other Diseases.—There are certain factors predisposing to tuberculous disease. Direct transmission is rare. Other influences may act by diminishing individual resistance to infection, or favouring massive or prolonged infection, e.g., overcrowding and insufficient ventilation in the home or work place; insanitary conditions of the dwelling (dampness, absence of sunlight, etc.) and poverty. Poverty is frequently responsible for lack of sufficient and suitable food and clothing, insanitary conditions of dwellings, overcrowding, ignorance of hygienic modes of life and of precautions against infection, and lack of proper ventilation.—*Annual Report of Chief Medical Officer of Ministry of Health, 1920.* Cmd. 1,397.

Startling Statistics.—Cmd. 363. Figures taken from *An Outline of the Practice of Preventive Medicine*. A Memorandum addressed to the Minister of Health by Sir G. Newman in 1919.

Tuberculosis (Pulmonary).

London, 1898, where overcrowding under 10 per cent., death rate 111 per 100,000 persons; where overcrowding over 25 per cent., death rate 209-239 per 100,000 persons.

Glasgow death rate from measles, whooping cough, diphtheria four times greater in one-room homes than in four and upward room houses.

Housing and Death Rates.

London, 1906.	Finsbury.	Hampstead.
Total death rate, 15.6.	20.7.	13.5.

(In six sub-registration districts in Finsbury, under twelve, in five others, over thirty.)

Finsbury, 1906, general death rate 6.4 in houses of four and more rooms, 39.0 in one-room houses.

Housing and Infantile Mortality Rates.

1891-1900, London (districts with under 10 per cent. overcrowding), 142 per 1,000 births; London (districts with over 25 per cent. overcrowding), 210-223 per 1,000 births.

London, 1906.	Finsbury.	Hampstead.
129	137	79 per thousand.
Finsbury—(i) Under 70 (7 sub-divisions), (ii) over 200 (19 sub-divisions), (iii) over 300 (4 sub-divisions).		

In Birmingham.—Return for period 1912-1916:—

	(1) Artisan area with bad housing.	(2) Artisan area with fair to good accommodation.
Population	154,662	133,623
Area (acres)	1,921	2,998
No. of houses	33,471	30,172
Birth rate	32.8	24.0
General death rate	21.1	12.3
Infantile mortality	171.0	89.0
Consumptive death rate	1.95	1.11
Measles	0.83	0.24
Diarrhoea	1.46	0.36

Overcrowding.—One-tenth of population lived in overcrowded tenements.

In night inspections in Central London I have myself counted seven or eight persons, adults and children, sleeping in one small tenement room.

In one street in 1901 the overcrowded tenements, as measured by the lenient standard of the by-laws, formed 73.4 per cent. of the whole.—Sir George Newman.

1911 Census figures, from pamphlet Cmd. 363, price 6d., which contains much valuable material on all health and housing questions.

THE GOVERNMENT'S FAILURE.

THE PRIME MINISTER.—We are only now crying a halt—not to stop building. There will not be a single house the less built. On the contrary, there will be more houses built . . . because we know that by pulling up now, by liquidating this gigantic obligation we have got upon us of 176,000 houses, and then, by meeting the building trade on equal terms, there will be more houses, cheaper. . . . I say this is simply an effort—and I use the phrase which I used before—not to stop building, but to put it on a better and more business-like footing.—*House of Commons, July 21, 1921.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND.—Moreover, there is no scrapping of the housing programme, and no refusal to resume it when financial conditions are more favourable. All we propose to do, as has been said from this box before—and it is worth repeating now—is to mark time and call a halt in approving tenders until sufficient progress has been made with the houses which are now under construction.—Mr. MUNRO, *Secretary for Scotland in the debate on the Scottish Estimates, July 28, 1921.*

A CAPITALIST REJOICES.—Lord Inchcape, speaking at the P. & O. Steam Navigation Company, Ltd., annual meeting, December, 1921, said:—

Fortunately, the Prime Minister stepped in and succeeded in limiting the number of houses to 176,000.

Lord Inchcape has a house in Mayfair and a castle in Ayrshire.

AN EXPERT COMMENT.—Under the housing schemes of 1,200 Local Authorities, upwards of 50,000 houses have already been built and a quarter of a million men, women and children have already found, or will shortly find, homes in them.

When the 250,000 houses for which commitments have already been made in Great Britain are built, a population of between a million and a million and a-half of people will be housed under proper conditions, in many cases for the first time in their lives. It is all very well for critics to say that if the carrying into effect of this work had been left to the forces of private enterprise, a far larger number of houses would have been built at a much lower cost. This statement is absolutely out of keeping with the recorded facts concerning housing progress in other countries.—*Memorandum on the Present Housing Situation (No. 22, Series B), National Housing and Town-Planning Council.*

"GOVERNMENT TO BLAME."—The worst offenders are declared to be the Government, and the blame for the present exorbitant price of bricks, cement, piping, etc., is in some quarters directly attributed to Government action. During the war, heavy contracts were made for the supply of these materials to the Government at fixed prices, and they were practically unobtainable by the private builder. The Government are still subject to enormous commitments under these contracts, and they are endeavouring to unload their liability either by direct sale, or through the contractors at the fixed price. They will not permit the contractors to sell Government bricks at less than the fixed price; and the contractors naturally claim that while they are selling bricks to the Government at something like 80s. a thousand, they cannot be expected to sell to others at 40s. a thousand.

BUILDING TRADE TRUSTS.*—The maintenance of these high prices (by building trade combinations) has not only retarded private building and the supply of necessary houses; it has also inflicted a heavy burden on the rate-payers, and was one of the main contributory causes of the curtailment of the Government's scheme for the provision of working men's houses.—*The Times (December 12, 1921).*

FAILURE TO DEAL WITH TRUSTS.—The Government contemplated the bringing in of legislation this year dealing with trusts in trade and industry. In November, 1920, it was announced in the House of Commons by Sir R. Horne, then President of the Board of

Trade, that the Government had their proposals ready and hoped it would be possible to lay them before Parliament in the following session. For some unexplained reason this has not been done, though, in addition to the disclosures made by committees under the Profiteering Acts as to trusts in building materials, a Special Committee appointed by the Ministry of Health reported last July that there was an unwarrantable tendency to maintain the high prices of building materials in post-war contracts.—*The Times (December 17, 1921).*

A BUILDER'S EVIDENCE.—Some striking instances of the operations of trade combinations were given to a representative of *The Times* by Mr. A. G. Shearing, of Fortress Road, Kentish Town, who has had wide experience in the building trade and was formerly chairman of the works department of the St. Pancras Borough Council. He produced documentary evidence to show that for some years past the whole of the contracts for building materials for the municipal councils in London, and, no doubt, elsewhere, have been fixed, not in London, but

at the head offices of builders' merchants' combines in the Midlands,

thus reducing public tender to a farce. At least ninety-five per cent. of the trading in materials for house construction is controlled by the trusts. The remaining merchants have a great trouble to trade at all without running the risk of having their supplies cut off.

Grates, Stoves, etc.

One of the most powerful of these trade combinations is the National Light Casting Association, which controls the price of iron castings used in house building, such as grates, stoves, mantels, registers, rain-water pipes, baths, etc. By a system of deferred rebates, or pooling system, the Association enforces strict conformity to the price list, and makes it difficult for any competitor outside the Association to market his goods. Under this pooling system a member of the Association is penalised if he

sells below the standard price

fixed by the Association, and receives compensation if, owing to refusal to sell at a reduced price, he fails to do business.

"One Thousand Per Cent."

One effect of this combination, Mr. Shearing stated, has been to open the door to foreign competition, and iron goods are now obtainable at twenty per cent. below the prices fixed by the combine. The foreign manufacturers send over their agents to this country. They approach small firms, who get orders from various builders, and the goods are delivered direct from the dock. A German bath costs only £6 10s., as against £10 charged by the combine. The combine, it is only fair to add, deals only in English castings. Mr. Shearing estimates that, apart from the manufacturers' extra profit, the builders' merchants who deal in castings are making something like 1,000 per cent. over pre-war profits.

Arranging the Tenders.

Mr. Shearing also produced examples of the instructions sent by the Midland Pipe Association to its members who contemplated tendering for borough council contracts in London. These documents cover a series of years, and refers to tenders advertised for by the borough councils of Islington, Woolwich, Bethnal Green, Southwark and Acton. The instruction relating to Bethnal Green bears the following footnote:—

* For further information about Trusts see pp 30 to 40.

SCHEMES IN ABEYANCE.—On December 17, 1920, the Board of Education issued the following circular to Education Authorities:—

I am directed by the Board of Education to inform you of the decision of the Government that, "except with fresh Cabinet authority, schemes involving expenditure not yet in operation are to remain in abeyance," and to request that, pending further communications from the Board relating to proposals of the Authority which have been made for the extension or development of the Educational System, the Authority will not incur or commit themselves to incurring any new expenditure which may be affected by that decision.

ROBBING THE CHILDREN.—This official statement shows that the Government has confiscated the educational rights of our children. The Act, having been placed on the Statute Book, the Government has adopted a financial policy that made it inoperative, without an amending Act or the direct consent of the House. Not only has the Act been suspended, but the educational rights of a very large number of children have been confiscated. If the Government suspended payment of interest on War Bonds, this would not mean confiscation, it would simply involve deferred payment. The educational opportunities which so many thousands of children have lost as the result of the suspension of the Act cannot be made good to them by making the Act operative a few years hence. Thus, so far as the children are concerned, the policy of the Government has been one of confiscation.

COST OF EDUCATION.

Year.	Average Attendance.	Expenditure.	Cost per child.	Percentage Comparison.
1913-14	5,397,470	£26,000,000	66.4d.	100
1920-21	5,300,300	56,000,000	211.4d.	219

This represents an increase of 119 per cent. *The Labour Gazette* (July 1, 1920) gives the increase in the cost of living as being 152 per cent. The increase in the cost of elementary education is, therefore, considerably less than the increase in the cost of living.

THREE YEARS' EXPENDITURE.—The following figures show the net total of the vote for the Board of Education for the current and for the two preceding years:—

1920-21	£45,755,507
1919-20	32,772,473
1918-19	19,334,705

The increase in these years was, therefore, £26,420,862. Of this amount reforms and extensions in the system of education were only responsible for an increase of £310,000.

FOR EDUCATION: FOR WAR.—Percentage increase in Cost of Education compared with the Increase in the cost of Armed Forces of the Crown:—

	1913-14.	1919-20.	Increase per cent.
Education (Parliamentary Votes)	£19,645,000	£58,695,000	200
Armed Forces of the Crown	72,544,000	230,400,000	215

For the cost of one battleship I could give the country as much continuation schooling as, having regard to our supply of teachers and the cost of building, we are at all likely to develop for a period of seven years.—Mr. FISHER, Minister of Education.

REVENUE AND EDUCATION.

Year.	National Revenue.	National Expenditure on Education.	Per cent.
1913-14	£198,243,000	£19,645,000	10
1920-21	1,108,000,000	58,695,000	5

	Pounds per £100 in Taxation.	Actual Expenditure 1920-21. Millions.
Interest on National Debt	£24½	345
Repayment of Debt	17	234
War Pensions	9	123
Army, Navy, Air Force (two years after Armistice)	16½	230
Education	4	56

RELATIVE COSTS.

BOARD OF EDUCATION ESTIMATES.

1913-14	... £14,369,000 actual expenditure.
1922-23	... £50,600,000 estimate.

(Figures given in Geddes Report.)

If prices are, on the average, 80 per cent. above 1913-14 level the Board's expenditure, expressed in terms of money of similar purchasing power, would be double what it was in 1913-14.

Note 1.—Admitted inadequacy of educational provision and facilities before the war.

Note 2.—Growing popular demand in recent years for a better system of education, e.g., *Education Act, 1918*, on the Statute Book, but inoperative.

If the estimates are cut, again assuming prices 80 per cent. above pre-war prices, the Board's present expenditure on education would be much less than double prewar expenditure; on the Geddes figures given only one-third.

COST PER CHILD.—Expenditure on elementary education in terms of cost per child:

	Expressed in terms of 1913-14 values.					
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1913-14	4	16	6	...	4	16 6
1919-20	8	17	7	...	4	1 8
1920-21	11	9	0	...	4	9 10
1921-22	12	4	4	...	6	6 8
1922-23	12	7	6	...	6	17 6

(These figures are taken from the Geddes Report.)

If average prices are reckoned for 1922-23 as 80 per cent. above pre-war level, the increase is rather over 40 per cent. on pre-war expenditure per child.

Analysis of £12 7s. 6d. the figure gives for 1922-23 based on "cost per unit of average attendance."

	£ s. d.
Salaries of teachers	8 8 0
Loan charge	0 12 0
Special Services:	
Schools for defective children	0 6 0
Medical inspection and treatment	0 7 0
Provision of meals	0 1 6
Administration	0 11 0
Other expenditure	2 2 0

£12 7 6

"CUTS" IN OPERATION.—Expenditure on education has already been "cut" below what was considered necessary in 1918 since the Government's failure to appoint a day has "saved" expenditure on Continuation Schools and on the pension liability which would be incurred for teachers in these schools.

Local education authorities are encouraged to "save" by neglecting arrears of work, e.g., in the building of new schools when the Board's inspectors affirm that they are necessary.

*See Report of Durham County Education Committee, April, 1919—December, 1921.

Out of 702 school departments in the country, 250 overcrowded.

Deficiency of 8,628 school places.

"Makeshift accommodation" for 3,700 children.

Pressure is no longer brought to bear by the Board on backward authorities.

TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Mr. Fisher, speaking at Birmingham (February 25, 1922), under joint auspices of Chamber of Commerce and the University:

"The Government will preserve its engagement with the teachers—that is a matter of public faith."

"An anxious and depressed teacher is a bad teacher, and an embittered teacher is a social danger."—Mr. H. A. L. Fisher.

TEACHERS' SALARY SCALES.

AVERAGE SALARIES, 1912-13. ENGLAND AND WALES.

	£	s.	d.
Headmasters	175	4	0
Headmistresses	124	11	0
Class masters	128	7	0
Class mistresses	94	7	0

Teachers did not press demands for higher salaries during the war, 1914-16, while prices rose 80 per cent. The Fisher grant was then given. In 1919 the Burnham Committee was set up, and the Board of Education pledged itself to pay grants on the basis of the scale arrived at until March 31, 1925.

Lord Burnham, at Deacons School, Peterborough, February, 1922, declared that "the teachers had a contract with the local authorities, confirmed by the Treasury, that the present scales of salaries should continue in force until 1925—and the scales would endure till then if the principles of fair dealing were observed. The teaching profession had an indefeasible moral claim, and he would not remain a member of any body which treated the contract as a scrap of paper."

TEACHERS' PENSIONS.

Before 1918 there was in operation a contributing pensions scheme for teachers. The School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1918 established a non-contributory scheme making provision for pensions, disablement allowances (in case of breakdown), and death gratuities in case of death before pensionable age or shortly after pensionable age is reached.

CONTINUED EDUCATION.—Report of Higher Education Sub-Committee publishes statement by a principal of a school:

Even in this short and experimental period quite enough talent has been discovered to prove the criminal waste of cutting off education at the age of 14.

Quoted by *Times Educational Supplement*, February 25, 1922, which also says:

There is in London a great volume of talent among children of the age of 11 years and upwards, which, under the existing system never secures a chance, as the result of an unfair scholarship system and methods of selection that ought not to be applied to young children.

EDUCATION AND CRIME.—It may be assumed that about £100,000,000 is being spent this year on education by the State and the municipalities combined. The Police Bill comes to some £70,000,000. If we add to the cost of the police the cost of Prisons, Criminal Courts, and so on, we should find that as a nation we are spending as much on punishing crime as in removing by education those factors which are the cause of crime.

VALUE OF EDUCATION.—Hostile critics declare that the nation is not receiving value for its money and that little or no good results have accrued from the new Act. The answers are:—

Moral and spiritual values and even intellectual values cannot be tested by statistics, far less can they be tested in such a short time.

The new Act has been in operation only since May, 1919. The results of education cannot be estimated in a year. It may not be possible to estimate them till a generation has gone by. "Many years must elapse," says *The Scotsman*, "after the 1918 Acts go into full operation before they can at the best have any appreciable effect upon the education level of the country."

That our system of education has greatly enhanced the intellectual and moral worth of the nations since the passing, say, of the Act of 1872, is patent to every competent observer. Even the extension of Intermediate and Secondary and Continuation education during the past twenty or thirty years has produced quite remarkable results. Further extension is bound to produce still better results.

TRUE AND FALSE ECONOMY.—No one but a lunatic would suppose that money could really be saved upon education if the education itself were such as to increase the productive powers of the workers. One might as well propose to save money by refusing to buy new machinery, or to repair the old when necessary.

One thing is certain, namely, that if we do save money on our education we shall condemn more and more of our children to such low grades of labour—in which few arts and little training are needed—while the countries which do not save money so will not so condemn their children. It may be a dangerous experiment to neglect the Army or Navy, but the evil results of such neglect are not immediate; war might be avoided during the period of neglect, but the trade competition between nations can never be avoided, and the effects of failure in that competition are certain and may be permanent. The less a nation spends on its education, the less it will have to spend, for it will have starved the goose that lays the golden eggs.—*Times Educational Supplement*, Saturday, February 25, 1922.

The Speakers' Handbook

LABOUR AND EDUCATION.

THE LABOUR PARTY claims the right for the education of the children of this country to be independent of the economic position of its parents.

The child must have full opportunity for development according to its talents and capabilities.

The Labour Party will continue to resist the economy campaign for education, as it believes that no economy can be effected in this walk of life without extremely disastrous results to the well-being of the future thinking race.

The Labour Party wishes to see the standards of equipment and general conditions which obtain in Secondary Schools applied to Elementary Schools.

It desires to give full opportunity to teachers to enable them to do their best work.

It desires to see University admission made easy for the children of the working classes.

The Labour Party has published definitely formulated views on the subject of:—Nursery Schools; Elementary Schools; Training of Elementary Teachers; Continuation Schools; Central Schools; Secondary Education; Maintenance; Vocational Instruction; Technical Education; Medical Treatment; Physical Training; Holidays; Status of Teachers; Advisory Bodies; Adult Education; Libraries. Particulars from Publication Department, the Labour Party, 33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.2.

PARTY RESOLUTION.—At the Annual Conference at Brighton in June, 1921, the following resolution was agreed upon:—

That this Conference protests against any curtailment of educational opportunities upon grounds of national economy, and demands for the mass of the workers the provision of the best possible educational facilities as an essential condition to the future well-being of the people.

MATERNITY AND CHILD WELFARE.

INFANTILE MORTALITY.—In 1918, 97 per 1,000 infants born died within a year. In 1919, 89 per 1,000. In 1920, 80 per 1,000.

This is the average, and according to the Chief Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health in his Report for 1920, it "is higher in urban than in rural areas," and industrial towns especially show a much higher rate than the average figures for 1920.

Middlesbrough	136	per 1,000
Darlington	133	" "
Sunderland	119	" "
Tynemouth	118	" "

This is the death rate amongst legitimate children. The figures for the same year for the illegitimate children are much more appalling:—

Bury	381	per 1,000
West Bromwich	311	" "

The same report of the Chief Medical Officer points out that the infantile death rate is "high among the poor and low among the better off. In 1911 in England and Wales the infantile mortality of all classes was 132 per 1,000 births, of unskilled workers 152, of the intermediate class 106, and of the middle and upper class only 76."

In Australia the mortality in 1919 was only 69 per 1,000.

MATERNAL MORTALITY.

In 1918, 3.55 per 1,000 mothers died in childbirth.

In 1919, 4.12 " " " " " "

In 1920, 4.12 " " " " " "

Thus, while infant mortality has been decreasing for some years, the number of maternal deaths due to childbirth, which for many years remained practically stationary, have recently begun to increase. As the Chief Medical Officer says, this fact is "extremely disquieting." So serious is it that the whole question of maternal mortality require full investigation, and this has now been arranged for under the supervision of Dr. Janet Campbell.

AVOIDABLE SUFFERING.—The general effect of lack of sufficient care is set forth in a Memorandum of the Ministry of Health (M. & C.W. 15), which states that "the amount of avoidable sickness and suffering arising out of childbirth is one of the tragedies of our working-class mothers. . . . The number of maternity centres is insufficient and the arrangements, even where most advanced, are imperfect. . . . A considerable saving of infant life as well as maternal life and injury might be effected if facilities were improved."

HEALTH OF THE CHILD.—The above are the facts with regard to actual mortality, but to quote from the same Report, "to reduce infant mortality is not enough. We must also safeguard the health of the living child." That this depends upon adequate provision for maternity and child welfare is pointed out in the Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education for 1920, who states that the "physical welfare and, in part, the education of the child of school age is dependent in its origin upon ante-school conditions." How unsatisfactory these are may be judged from the following figures:—

Out of the 2,434,252 school children examined in 1920, no less than 47.9 per cent. were found to be suffering from defects.

The Speakers' Handbook

ABNORMAL CHILDREN.—Those suffering from serious defects, and classified in the Annual Report for 1920 of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education as abnormal children, are 12 per cent. of the whole child population in England and Wales.

The figures are as follows:—

Blind	6,000
Deaf	6,000
Mentally defective	37,000
Epileptic	6,500
Tubercular	20,000
Cripples	36,000
Other defects	53,000

164,500

GOVERNMENT'S "ECONOMIES."

According to the Ministry of Health's own memorandum, the number of maternity centres is absolutely inadequate (*see above*). In the year 1920-21, there were only 1,780 such centres.

While this is admitted, only £873,850 was granted from the Exchequer in the year 1920-21 towards expenditure incurred in all forms of maternity and child welfare work. Compare this with the £300,000,000 spent on armaments.

Again, early in the year, the Ministry began to urge Local Authorities to cut down expenditure on their maternity and child welfare schemes. This, despite the fact that the figures for expenditure by Local Authorities show how small a part it takes in the services provided by the municipality. It ranks in 1918-19 very little higher than the amount spent by them on allotments and small-holdings, and considerably lower than that spent on cemeteries or markets. What little encouragement has been given by the Central Authorities in the form of grants is gradually being withdrawn.

COALITION STEPS BACKWARD.

(1) Refusal to ratify Maternity Convention (*see "Washington Conventions"*).

(2) Economising on mothers and babies.

Milk Grants.—In the spring of 1921, the Ministry issued Circular 185 restricting the distribution of free milk by local authorities, placing it under stringent regulations, reducing the amount, which might be given, and practically prohibiting it for children between three and five years of age.

In September, the Ministry issued a still more deadly Circular (234) stating that the Ministry would only pay 50 per cent. grant for the first half-year (April-September, 1921), and that for the second half-year the grant would be reduced to 5 per cent. This, despite the fact that local Committees had made their schemes on the understanding that 50 per cent. would be paid. Strong action on the part of Labour women secured the withdrawal of Circular 234, which means that 50 per cent. will be paid until March, 1922, but there is no assurance that it will be continued after then. Moreover, Circular 185 is still in force.

A later circular (No. 267), issued in December, 1921, demands drastic enforcement of 185 and even extends the general policy of economy on mothers and babies, stating quite definitely that the supply of milk must be curtailed. The proposals are:—

That meals be provided for expectant and nursing mothers instead of milk. These are to be consumed at

The Speakers' Handbook

feeding centres on five days of the week only, the cost as a rule not to exceed 6d. per head per meal.

Milk for babies over twelve months is discouraged, and mothers are encouraged to nurse them up to that age, a policy against all medical opinion.

Thus, the Ministry is adopting the policy of "*Stint the fresh milk and stunt the child*" all along the line.

LABOUR'S POLICY.

GENERAL.—The Labour Party holds that the present wide permissive powers given to local authorities under the Maternity and Child Welfare Act should be made compulsory and should be assisted by large grants from national funds. There should be within the reach of every woman medical advice and treatment, and nursing care with help in the home both before and after the birth of her child. Pure milk should be freely given for mothers and their infants, and the medical supervision and treatment of the children should be available until they are under the School Medical Service.

MATERNITY CONVENTION.—Further, the Party stands for the ratification of the Maternity Convention. This gives six weeks' rest and maintenance after confinement, and the right to claim, if desired, six weeks' rest and pay before confinement. The Labour Party holds that this should be extended to all mothers, not only those in industry.

HOUSING.—The improved housing policy for which the Party stands would have direct results in improving the health of both mother and child.

Finally, the Labour Party believes that national strength depends upon a healthy childhood.

PENSIONS FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

In 1920, and again in 1921, the Labour Party presented a Bill to Parliament to provide for pensions being payable to any woman with one or more dependent children who is

(a) a widow;

(b) a woman deserted by her husband or who has obtained a judicial separation from her husband; or

(c) the wife of a man, where the man is unable through illness or incapacity or through being an invalid, adequately to maintain such wife and children;

(d) a woman who has been habitually living with a man, since deceased, as his wife, although not married to him;

at the following rates:—

Dependent children.	Per week. s. d.
One	36 8
Two	44 2
Three	50 2
Each additional child over three ...	6 0

Where the illness, incapacity or invalidity of a husband is temporary, the pension would only be payable so long as no other payment is being made by any public authority to the husband or wife in respect of such illness.

On the re-marriage of a widow a pension would continue to be paid in respect of the maintenance of her children. Her own pension would be discontinued.

Women's pensions would be administered by the same authorities and in like manner with the Old Age Pension Acts, with the exception that only women would be appointed as pensions officers for the purpose of women's pensions.

A LABOUR RESOLUTION.—Resolution of Labour Party Annual Conference, June, 1921:—

It further urges that immediate provision, wholly unconnected with the Poor Law, should be made for the payment of adequate pensions to mothers with children dependent upon them, on the lines proposed by the Labour Party in their Mothers' Pensions Bill, 1920, so that they may be free to devote themselves to the care of their children.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

The Present Situation.

NUMBER OF PENSIONS.—The total number of pensions payable on Friday, March 31, 1921, was:

Men	353,794
Women	648,548

1,002,342

These, however, were at varying rates, as follows:

936,517 at 10s. rate.

20,459 „ 8s. „

17,174 „ 6s. „

12,670 „ 4s. „

6,153 „ 2s. „

1,629 „ 1s. „

1,740 not yet adjusted to the new rates under the Old Age Pensions Act, 1919.

COST.

The total amount paid in pensions for the year ending March 31, 1921, was	£25,087,000
Cost of administration of Pension Committees	65,333
Cost of administration of Post Office, etc.	708,051

Total cost of scheme £25,860,384

(The above particulars were given in the House of Commons in answer to a question by Mr. G. Thorne on June 27, 1921.—*Offic. Deb.*, June 27, col. 1841.)

REGULATIONS AND CONDITIONS.

- (1) The person must have attained the age of seventy. (Act of 1908.)
- (2) The person must satisfy the pension authorities that for at least ten years up to the date of the receipt of any sum on account of a pension he has been a British subject.
- (3) The person must satisfy the pension authorities that his yearly means, as calculated under this Act, do not exceed forty-nine pounds, seventeen shillings and sixpence.

REMOVAL OF MEANS LIMIT.—The Report of the Departmental Committee on Old Age Pensions (Cmd. 410, of 1919) contains full comments on the proposal (Sec. 18). The Committee says:

“It was pointed out that the present system did undoubtedly militate against the promotion of thrift agencies and act as a deterrent to employers starting contributory schemes of old age endowment, and that, in so far as this was the case, the system was an adverse social influence. We are impressed with the idea that it is desirable in the future for industry to be so organised as to provide adequate pensions for all employees on their retirement, and we are of opinion that any system which tends to discourage the initiation of such schemes is detrimental to the community.

“We consider, on the whole, that it is impossible to differentiate equitably between various kinds of means, and we do not think that the mere doubling of the means limit would be more than a palliative. Such a course would, it is true, restore the relationship between

the pensions and the means limit, but it would leave the main criticism of the means limit untouched. The maintenance of the means limit even at twice its present figure would still necessitate full inquiries by the Pension Officer, and as regards borderline cases would still differentiate between those who had saved and those who had not saved, to the disadvantage of the thrifty.

"If many of the items of means which we have considered are for these reasons to be excluded, numbers of people would receive the old age pensions whose incomes approach the income tax limit. We have, therefore, carefully considered the possibility of adopting the income tax limit as the means limit for old age pensions. Such a plan would have the advantage of confining pensions to those whose incomes are below the level at which they can reasonably be expected to contribute towards the revenue of the State by direct taxation. The evidence we have taken shows that the adoption of this limit would involve a cost of £38,000,000, as against the £32,000,000 involved in doubling the present means limit with a 10s. pension."

Thus it is perfectly clear that the Majority on the Committee advocated the removal of the means limit; but the Government preferred to adopt the recommendations of the Minority, which held that (1) the country could not afford the additional amount, and (2) the proposal "abandons the criterion of need."

MR. HENDERSON'S MOTION.—Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., moved in the House of Commons on May 11, 1921:

"That, in the opinion of this House, the recommendation of the Departmental Committee on Old Age Pensions in favour of the repeal of the provisions in the Old Age Pensions Acts as to calculation of means should be adopted, and the Old Age Pensions Acts amended accordingly, thereby enabling applicants for and recipients of the old age pension to derive the full benefit of their thrift and personal provision for old age and to receive assistance from friends, employers, and organisations without reduction of or disqualification for the full pension."

Mr. Henderson's proposal would involve an expenditure of £41,000,000 at 10s. per week for 1,577,000 persons of 60 years of age and over; but if the income tax level were adopted as a limit, the cost of the 1,462,000 persons at that level would be £38,000,000.

In favour of the Labour Party motion there were 123 votes; and against it 135.

THE DRINK TRAFFIC.

INFLUENCE OF THE TRADE.—"The Trade" has always exercised a political influence out of all proportion either to the numbers or wealth of those concerned. Its political power is no new thing. Thirty years ago, Lord Randolph Churchill described it in the following terms:—

The great obstacle to temperance reform undoubtedly is the wholesale manufacturers of alcoholic drink. These manufacturers are small in number, but they are very wealthy. They exercise enormous influence. Every publican in the country almost, certainly nine-tenths of the publicans, are their subjects and tied slaves. Public-houses in nine cases out of ten are tied houses. There is absolutely no free will, and these wholesale manufacturers of drink have an enormously powerful political organisation—so powerful, and so highly prepared, that it is almost like a Prussian Army. It can be mobilised and brought to bear on the point which is threatened. Up to now, this great class has successfully intimidated a Government, and successfully intimidated Members of Parliament; in fact, they have directly overthrown two Governments, and I do not wonder.

DRINK TRADE IN PARLIAMENT.—The power of "the Trade" has in recent years increased rather than diminished. The development of the "tied house" system has brought the brewers into direct relations with the public-houses and converted the licensees into their servants. Nine-tenths of public-houses are now "tied" houses. The conversion of private brewery firms into limited liability companies has increased the number of people who are financially interested in "the Trade." In both these ways the drink barons have strengthened their position.

The Brewers' Almanack for 1919 gives no less than 29 Members of the House of Commons directly connected with the drink trade. How many more are large shareholders in breweries, distilleries and similar concerns, could only be found by detailed investigation, but we may be sure that there will be a number. One of the 29 "members for the drink trade," Col. Hall Walker, has recently gone to join Viscount Iveagh (né Guinness) in the House of Lords. One of the most prominent of the remaining 28 is Sir George Younger, the chief Coalition Whip; another, Sir Rhys Williams, is Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport.

PROFITS ON BEER.—Compensation received by brewers during the Great War in respect of certain restrictions, namely, brewing low gravity beer (for which they were allowed to get a higher price) and restricted hours of sale (upon which "the trade" apparently thrived)—£6,200,000.

Profits of some leading firms during the period of so-called Government control:—

	1915-16.	1917-18.
Arnold Perrett	£14,427	£40,576
Bass	295,628	437,120
Ind Coope	2,484	262,953
Allsopps	36,811	181,062
Threlfalls	80,885	239,686
Watney, Coombe & Reid ...	206,009	472,974

The Drink Traffic

"Watered" Capital.

How the brewers were able to "water" their capital:— Mitchell and Butlers, the Birmingham brewers, to-day decided to make a further distribution of nearly £500,000 undivided profits in the form of additional share capital to existing holders. About £300,000 was so capitalised in 1916, and the chairman, Mr. Walter Butler, said there had been evidence of an increasing tendency to State control and ultimately to purchase after the war. The State should, therefore, have some indication of the capital values with which it was dealing.—*Newspaper extract*, January 22nd, 1918.

Price of Shares.

Rise in the price of shares during the period of so-called Government control:—

	1915.	1917.	1919.
Allsopps	2	25½	86
City of London	12½	91	185
Guinness	213½	307½	391½
Watney, Combe & Reid ...	10	85	169

THE BREWERS' BILL.—The objects of this "reform" Bill are to obtain greater security for "the trade" and less public interference. (1) Licensing justices are to be replaced by licensing judges, who will adjudicate over large licensing areas and to less subject them now to local public opinion. (2) Licensing Courts are to be empowered to limit on-licences "for a term not exceeding 21 years" (the present term is seven years); it may be transferred from one area to another. (3) The brewer is no longer to be penalised by the loss of his license in the case of misconduct on the part of his agent, the public-house keeper. The worst that could happen would be the transfer of the license to a more suitable agent.

LABOUR'S POLICY.

Resolution adopted at the Labour Party Annual Conference, June, 1920:—

This Conference believing that the liquor traffic is a trade in respect of which the people as a whole must assert full and unfettered power in accordance with local opinion, demands for this purpose that the localities should have conferred upon them facilities (a) to prohibit the sale of liquor within their own boundaries; (b) to reduce the number of licences, and regulate the conditions under which they may be held; and (c) if localities decide that licences shall be granted, to determine whether licences shall be under private or public control.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Who Are They?

NUMBER OF DIRECTORS.—There are 703 Members of the House of Lords, of whom 259 are given in the "Directory of Directors, 1921," as directors of companies.

Finance—Banking, insurance, investment, trust, etc.	140
Railways—Home and foreign	57
Mining—Coal, gold, etc.	30
Shipping	18
Breweries, hotels, etc.	14

COMMERCIAL PEERS.—Of these 256, many are directors of several companies, as, for instance:—

*Lord Incheape**.—Director of:—Anderson, Green & Co., Ltd.; Anglo-Persian Oil Co.; Atlas Assurance Co., Ltd.; Australasian United Steam Navigation Co., Ltd. (chairman); Binny & Co., Ltd.; British Oil Bunkering Co., Ltd.; Bulloch Brothers & Co., Ltd. (chairman); Burns, Philip & Co., Ltd.; Central Queensland Meat Export Co., Ltd. (chairman); Corporation of Foreign Bondholders; D'Arcy Exploration Co., Ltd.; Doodputtee Tea Co., Ltd.; Eastern and Australian Steamship Co., Ltd. (chairman); Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Co.; Eastern Telegraph Co., Ltd.; Great Western Railway Co.; Marine Insurance Co., Ltd.; National Provincial and Union Bank of England, Ltd.; Lloyd's and National Provincial Foreign Bank, Ltd.; Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Co. (chairman); British India Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. (chairman); F. & O. Banking Corporation Ltd. (chairman); Royal Bank of Scotland; Salomon Tea Co., Ltd.; Scottish Oils, Ltd.; Steamship Owners' Coal Association Ltd.; Strick Line, Ltd. (chairman); Suez Canal Co.; Walker, Sons & Co., Ltd. (chairman).

*Lord Faringdon**.—Director of:—Greenwood & Co., stockbrokers; Great Central Railway Co. (chairman); Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Co. (chairman); North Lindsey Light Railway Co.; Sheffield and South Yorkshire Navigation Co. (chairman); People's Trust Co., Ltd. (trustee).

Lord Aberconway.—Director of:—Barry Railway Co.; Vale of Glamorgan Railway Co.; Cortonwood Collieries, Co., Ltd.; Dalton Main Collieries, Ltd.; Firbeck Main Collieries, Ltd.; Harland & Wolff, Ltd.; John Brown & Co., Ltd. (chairman); Maltby Main Colliery Co., Ltd.; Metropolitan Railway Co. (chairman); Newstead Colliery Co., Ltd.; Oakdale Navigation Collieries, Ltd. (chairman); Palmer's Shipbuilding and Iron Co., Ltd.; Rossington Main Colliery Co., Ltd. (chairman); Sheepbridge Coal and Iron Co., Ltd. (chairman); Thomas Firth & Sons, Ltd.; Tredegar Iron and Coal Co., Ltd. (chairman); Wagon Finance Corporation, Ltd.

Viscount Furness.—Director of:—Aviation and General Insurance Co., Ltd. (chairman); Broomhill Collieries, Ltd. (vice-chairman); Cargo Fleet Iron Co., Ltd. (chairman); Cochrane & Co., Ltd.; Dominion Steel Corporation, Ltd.; Easington Coal Co., Ltd.; Furness Shipbuilding Co., Ltd. (chairman); East Coast Steel Corporation, Ltd. (chairman); Metal and Hardware Products, Ltd.; Seaton Carew Iron Co., Ltd.; South Durham Steel and Iron Co., Ltd.

* Members of Sir Eric Geddes' Economy Committee.

The Speakers' Handbook

(chairman); Weardale Steel, Coal and Coke Co., Ltd.; Wingate Coal Co., Ltd.

Lord Leverhulme, as well as being chairman of Lever Brothers, Ltd., is chairman of Mac-Fisheries, Ltd.

Lord Cowdray.—Director of:—S. Pearson & Son, Ltd. (president); S. Pearson & Son (Contracting Department), Ltd.

PRESS PEERS.—Lord Northcliffe (Harmsworth), *Times*, etc. Lord Rothermere (Harmsworth), *Daily Mirror*, etc. Lord Burnham (Levy-Lawson), *Daily Telegraph*. Lord Beaverbrook (Max Aitken), *Daily Express*, etc. Lord Riddell, *News of the World*, etc. Lord Dalziel, *Daily Chronicle*, etc. Lord Bathurst, *Morning Post*, Lord Astor, *Observer*.

Lord Northcliffe and Lord Rothermere are also directors of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, a company formed to acquire timber areas and water power in Newfoundland, and to carry on the manufacture of paper and pulp.

RAILWAY PEERS (57).—Aberconway, Ailsa, Ancaster, Anslow, Armstrong, Ashfield, Barrymore, Bathurst, Bessborough, Bledisloe, Breadalbane, Buccleuch, Bute, Churchill, Clinton, Dalhousie, Elgin, Elphinstone, Erskine, Exeter, Faringdon, Glanely, Glenarthur, Grey, Hamilton, Harrowby, Hothfield, Inchcape, Invercairn, Joicey, Kenmare, Kenyon, Kilbracken, Knaresborough, Knutsford, Lambourne, MacDonnell, Merthyr, Milner, Mount Edgecumbe, Oranmore and Browne, Pirrie, Powis, Fanfurly, Ribblesdale, St. Audries, St. Davids, St. Levan, Saltoun, Shaughnessy, Southborough, Southesk, Stuart, Sutherland, Tredegar, Tweeddale, Willoughby de Broke.

SHIPPING PEERS (18).—Aberconway, Abercorn, Imphill, Carisbrooke, Chalmers, Chesterfield, Forteviot, Furness, Glanely, Grey, Inchcape, Kilbracken, Litchfield, Londonderry, Pirrie, Weardale, Wemyss, Wittenham.

MINING PEERS (30).—Aberconway, Allendale, Armstrong, Belper, Bledisloe, Churston, Cozens-Hardy, Crawford, Darnley, Denbigh, Furness, Gainford, Galway, Glenarthur, Harris, Invercairn, Joicey, Lindsay, Londonderry, Lurgan, Marshall, Merthyr, Oranmore and Browne, Ribblesdale, Southborough, Sutherland, Teynham, Vaux, Verulam, Winchester.

BREWING PEERS (14).—Barnard, Desborough, Dewar, Forteviot, Glanely, Iveagh, Kenmare, Lurgan, Lytton, Monck, Rathdonnell, Revelstoke, Terrington, Tweedmouth.

LANDOWNING PEERS.

London Landlords.—Duke of Westminster, large estates in Mayfair, Belgravia, Pimlico; Lord Portman, large estates round Regent's Park; Duke of Bedford, large estates in the Strand, Bloomsbury, Southampton Row and Tottenham Court Road; Duke of Norfolk (a minor), large estates in the Strand; Earl Cadogan, large estates in Chelsea; Lord Camden, estates in Camden Town; Lord Salisbury, estates in the Strand and Shaftesbury Avenue; Lord Amherst, estates in Hackney; Lord Northampton, estates in Clerkenwell; Lord Howard de Walden, large estates in the West End of London.

MAINLY PLUTOCRATS.—Thus, the House of Lords is now a more purely plutocratic assembly than at any previous time. Its members largely consist of men who have obtained their peerages by giving contributions of

House of Lords

anything up to £100,000 to the Tory and Liberal party funds. Little has been heard of the House of Lords lately because a Tory-Coalition Government has been in power, but it will come out into the lime-light as soon as a Labour Government comes into office.

REFORM OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Tory-Coalitionists are now advocating "Reform of the House of Lords." What is the meaning of this? Behind this cry is the intention of strengthening it as a weapon with which to fight Labour. The House of Lords, while it consists, as at present, of hereditary peers, knows that the people will not allow it to revive its veto or to touch finance. Reform means that a certain number of persons who are not peers will in some way or other be introduced into the House of Lords. It will still have a reactionary and capitalistic majority, but the proportion of non-hereditary members will enable the Tories to claim that as it is democratic, the veto must be restored. To "reform" the House of Lords is merely an excuse to strengthen the House of Lords, and use it to defeat Labour even when Labour has won at the polls.

THE BRYCE SCHEME.—The new House of Lords is to consist of two parts: (1) the first, containing eighty-one Members, is to consist of Peers, selected by a committee of ten persons, of whom five will be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons and five by the new House of Lords; (2) the second section is to consist of 246 Members, chosen for twelve years by the House of Commons (one-third retiring every four years).

The scheme, shortly put, means that a quarter of the new House of Lords is to consist of Peers chosen by ten persons only, who have themselves no representative capacity; the other three-quarters will be elderly and worn-out politicians not directly elected by the people, and representing the views of dead Parliaments which sat eight, ten, and twelve years before.

This proposal would therefore create a House of Lords which, while it is bound to be of a thoroughly reactionary character, can claim that, as it is not hereditary, its veto should be restored.

This scheme was the outcome of a conference appointed by the Prime Minister in August, 1917. We deal with the scheme because it may be referred to in the election. It consisted of members of all parties, but the Labour Members voted against its evil features.

UNOFFICIAL TORY SCHEME.—Sir Peter J. Mackie, distiller and Coalition Tory, has advocated in *The Glasgow Herald* a "reformed" House of Lords consisting of:—

- 1—Princes of royal blood.
- 2—Hereditary Peers, 100 strong, to be elected by the hereditary Peers.
- 3—Elected members, 150 strong, to be elected by county groups of income-tax payers. Qualification: Payment of income-tax for three years.
- 4—Nominated members (25) by the Government.
- 5—One representative each (six in all) from the Dominions overseas.

This is, of course, purely unofficial, but it indicates the Tory trend of mind.

The Speakers' Handbook

LABOUR POLICY.

Labour policy on the question of a Single Chamber is quite clear. So long ago as 1907 the party moved an amendment in the House that:—

The Upper House, being an irresponsible part of the Legislature and of necessity representative only of interests opposed to the general well-being, is a hindrance to national progress, and ought to be abolished.

In 1918, at the Annual Conference of the Labour Party, the following resolution was formally moved, seconded, and agreed to:—

That this Conference declares that the House of Commons shall be the supreme authority in all matters of national legislation and finance, declares that a hereditary chamber such as the House of Lords should be abolished, and expresses its confirmed opposition to any form of Second Chamber, whether elected by the House of Commons or otherwise.

This resolution was apparently passed in view of the Speaker's Conference on the Second Chamber.

Finally, at the London Conference in June, 1918, the following resolution was carried:—

That this Conference calls for the abolition of the House of Lords without replacement by another Second Chamber.

It will thus be seen that the Labour Party is opposed to all such proposals as these considered above, and holds that what is needed is to *improve the House of Commons by bringing it more closely in touch with the people.*

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STATE OF PARTIES.

	Dec., 1918.	Dec., 1921.
*Co.-Unionists	335	359
Co.-Liberals	127	125
Co. Nat. Dem. Party	11	9
Co.-Labour	—	3
Total Coalition	473	496
*Unionists	48	11
Liberals	34	31
Labour	63	71
Independents	—	10
Nationalists	7	7
Other Parties	9	6
	161	136
Coalition Majority	312	360

* Includes 25 Irish Members both in 1918 and 1921. The 48 Unionists Members were non-official Coalition.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.—How the votes were cast in December, 1918:— England, Scotland, and Wales.

COALITION :		
Unionist	3,484,269	5,091,528
Liberal	1,445,738	
N.D.P.	161,521	
NON-COALITION :		
Liberal	1,298,806	4,569,486
Unionist	365,982	
Labour	2,374,385	
Other	550,311	
Total votes cast	9,681,014	

BY-ELECTIONS.—Votes in contested by-elections, 1919-1921 (to December 31st, 1921):—

Aggregate Poll.	Liberal.	Labour.	Other Candidates
585,154	218,661	434,654	102,816
Total Coalition Vote,	Total non-Coalition Vote,		
586,154.	756,131.		

CAPITALISTS IN THE COALITION.—The following is an analysis of the business interests of Members of Parliament on October 15th, 1920:—

- (1) THE GOVERNMENT 55
Members of the Government who hold paid office. Not included in (2) and (3).
- (2) BUSINESS ENTERPRISE 310
Members of Parliament directly and publicly concerned in financial, commercial, and agricultural businesses, generally as directors, partners, or proprietors. Not included in (1) and (3).
- (3) LEGAL PROFESSION 59
Barristers and Solicitors. Not included in (1) and (2).

The Speakers' Handbook

Apart from the Sinn Fein members (73), only 200 members of Parliament have not been placed within one of the above groups. These are either professional men, men of "independent means," or men whose business associations are not disclosed in the easily accessible reference books which we have consulted. Investors, as distinguished from those who have publicly avowed responsibility for the conduct of business, have not appeared in our lists.

The opposition to the Labour Party in the House of Commons resembles a mass meeting of employers and shareholders, assisted by their legal representatives.

GROUPS OF "INTERESTS."—Mr. Churchill is anxious that political parties should be organised on the lines of "intellectual and moral cleavage." We have found it more simple to resolve the Parliamentary opposition to Labour into groups which follow the lines of division indicated in the "Stock Exchange Year Book":—

FINANCE	109
Banks	30
Insurance	59
Investment, Trust, and Finance	58
LAND AND AGRICULTURE	54
LIQUOR TRADE	38
METAL AND ENGINEERING	78
General Engineering	30
Iron, Coal and Steel	35
Metals	6
Mining, Exploration, and Smelting	20
OIL	10
PRESS	21
FOOD AND CLOTHING	42
Food	29
Clothing and General Furnishing	18
TEXTILE	21
General	1
Cotton	14
Wool	6
TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATION	90
General	5
Motor Trade	11
Home Railways	40
Foreign Railways	6
Shipping, Dock, Canal and Harbour	37
Telegraph and Telephone	4
Tramways, Omnibus, Wagons and Cabs	7
GAS, WATER AND ELECTRIC	20
GENERAL MERCHANTS AND MANUFACTURERS	43
CHEMICALS	11
PAPER, PRINTING, ETC.	8
RUBBER AND PLANTATIONS	10
THEATRES, MUSIC HALLS, CINEMAS	4
FILMS, BIOSCOPES, PHOTOGRAPHY	6
TOBACCO	3

POWER OF THE PRESS.

Ownership and Circulation.

The direction of public opinion can be determined by the controllers of the press, says a French writer, as easily as a pointsman sends a train to the north or the west. This is, perhaps, an exaggeration, but Labour must take into its calculation the formidable power of the newspaper magnates.

It is probable that the Sunday publications exercise greater influence on working-class political opinion than other newspapers.

SUNDAY NEWSPAPERS.—The Sunday journals include:—

	Chief Proprietor.	Net Sale*	Advertisements† per page.
<i>News of the World</i>	Ld. Riddell ...	3,000,000	£1,770
<i>Sunday Pictorial</i>	Ld. Rothermere	2,362,769	1,000
<i>Sunday Herald</i>	Sir E. Hulton ...	1,069,325	600
<i>Sunday Chronicle</i>	Sir E. Hulton ...	914,063	805
<i>Weekly Dispatch</i>	Ld. Northcliffe	716,041	539
<i>Sunday Illustrated</i>	—	403,876	200
<i>Sunday Express</i>	Ld. Beaverbrook	279,757	269
<i>The Observer</i>	Ld. Astor ...	160,581	385

EVENING PAPERS.—Next in importance are the evening papers. In big provincial towns it is not unusual for an evening paper to command more than four times the circulation of a local morning paper. The following are some of the principal provincial journals:—*Manchester Evening Chronicle* (324,833)*; *Glasgow Evening Times* (277,293); *Birmingham Despatch* (198,452); *Yorkshire Telegraph and Star*, Sheffield (176,325); *South Wales Echo*, Cardiff (162,579); *Evening Express*, Cardiff (112,000); *Edinburgh Evening News* (97,522); *Northern Daily Telegraph*, Blackburn (70,000); *Hull Daily Mail* (60,578). The principal London evening papers are:—*Evening News* (727,034); *Star* (665,010); *Evening Standard* (377,954).

LONDON MORNING JOURNALS.—The following are details of the chief London morning papers:—

	Principal Proprietor.	Net Sale*	Advertisements† per page.
<i>Daily Mail</i>	Lord Northcliffe ...	1,532,709	£924
<i>Daily Mirror</i>	Lord Rothermere	1,002,882	280
<i>Daily Sketch</i>	Sir E. Hulton ...	837,054	280
<i>Daily Express</i>	Lord Beaverbrook	587,779	500
<i>Daily News</i>	Mr. Cadbury ...	436,992	308
<i>Daily Herald</i>	Labour ...	210,513	108

LOCAL WEEKLIES.—In addition to these, there are about 1,200 local weeklies, which are read extensively by the people who ought to vote Labour. Many of these newspapers are owned or subsidised by sitting Members, or by persons who hope to become Members. Those which are not flourishing financially are very glad to accept free

* Figures for April, 1922. In some cases the number is a minimum. The considerable increases in net sales made by some of the morning newspapers in the first months of 1922 are ascribed to the insurance schemes.

† Calculated according to inch or column rate. Size of page varies.

"copy," and various anti-Labour organisations supply them gratis with features, including cartoons and leading articles.

The profits of newspapers are derived in the main from advertisements, and not from sales. The advertisement revenue depends not merely on circulation, but on the advertisers' estimates of the purchasing-power of readers.

ADVERTISING REVENUE.—Lord Beaverbrook estimates that the revenue from advertising in London newspapers totals £13,000,000 a year, of which the morning papers take £9,000,000 and the evening and Sunday papers £4,000,000 (*Newspaper World*, May 20, 1922).

NEWSPAPER MILLIONAIRES.—Lord Northcliffe has the following in his pamphlet, "Newspapers and Their Millionaires":

Behind every single London daily newspaper, with the possible exception of some sporting journals and a Labour publication, of which I know nothing, there is a multi-millionaire, a millionaire, or a very wealthy colleague, a Shipping King, a Cotton-Waste King, Coal Kings, an Oil King, and the rest of them.

PRINCIPAL PROPRIETORS.—The Northcliffe group own the *Daily Mail*, the *Times*, the *Evening News* and a host of other publications ranging down to *Chuckles*; the Rothermere group own the *Daily Mirror*, the *Leeds Mercury* and the *Glasgow Record*; Hulton's have the *Sunday Chronicle*, the *Daily Sketch*, the *Daily Dispatch*, etc.; the Government group (Lord Dalziel, etc.) own the *Daily Chronicle*, *Reynolds's*, the *Edinburgh Evening News*. Beginning as proprietors of *Boxing*, the *Berry Brothers* own the *Sunday Times*, the *Financial Times*, *Cassell's*, etc., and Mr. Seymour Berry (coalowner) is a director of the *Western Mail*, of Cardiff. This Tory journal is as conspicuous in its attacks on Labour as the *Yorkshire Observer* (Wee Free), owned by Sir James Hill (wool magnate). Lord Cowdray (oil) finances the *Westminster Gazette*. Sir John Leigh (cotton), Coalition Member for Clapham, is the chief proprietor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. When the affairs of a company that formerly owned the *Globe* were wound up the Official Receiver said that the company was promoted by a London bank to use the newspaper as an advertising medium for industrial concerns in which the bank was interested.

ANTI-LABOUR PROPAGANDA.—The main object of these newspapers is to poison the public mind against Labour. Since the Armistice they have devoted increased attention to industrial news, and every journalistic device is employed to prejudice their readers against the workers. Headlines are used to suggest untruths, vital facts are omitted, weaker aspects of the workers' case are unduly emphasised, and in some cases resort is made to downright lying. The *Daily Herald* exercises a valuable and increasing corrective influence. Its columns are carefully scanned in all the capitalist newspaper offices to see if they have missed good industrial "stories."

With political news the method of boycott is preferred. Immense Labour meetings are held in provincial towns, and the local capitalist papers either dismiss them with a few lines or publish no report at all. In one town in America this boycott was broken down by Labour folk who wrote to advertisers stating that they would not buy from them while the boycott continued. Labour speeches in Parliament are treated very cavalierly by the London morning papers. The *Times*, for instance, often deludes itself into the belief that its public desires to be more fully informed about what Sir Frederick Banbury says than about the utterances of Mr. Clynes or Mr. Henderson. A

hostile review of the Labour Party's pamphlet on agricultural problems appeared simultaneously in about a score of widely-scattered journals.

ATTACKS ON WORKERS.—Readers of many newspapers must often be surprised at Labour victories in by-elections, because they are scarcely informed of the existence of the Labour candidates. During a recent by-election a Wee Free newspaper complained bitterly that an official pronouncement had been given exclusively to a Tory rival, and claimed that its news columns were full and impartial. In the same issue there was an elaborate by-election "story" which did not even mention the Labour candidate, who, incidentally, was returned! A newspaper in a seaport occupied itself for months with an attempt to rouse the resentment of unemployed transport workers against the miners. Articles and cartoons about the luxurious life and the big cigars of the miners were produced day by day for a long period, and the effort met with partial success among the less-thoughtful section of the people it was designed to influence. This newspaper is owned principally by coalowners! Organisations supported by coalowners maintain a continuous press campaign against the miners. Some employers' associations brief journalists in Parliament and elsewhere to supply them with propagandist material—"pars with a punch"—against their employees, for distribution to the newspapers. Every big industrial dispute is preceded by intensive Press attacks on the workers concerned.

LABOUR PRESS POLICY.

Means of combating the formidable power of the anti-Labour Press have been considered by the Joint Council of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress. It has assumed financial responsibility for the *Daily Herald*. Some 46 weeklies and about 75 monthlies are owned by various Labour organisations. Contrast this with Germany's total of over 150 Labour-Socialist dailies, France's 11, and Austria's 7, not to mention the immense number of weekly and monthly journals published in those countries! The policy of the Joint Council is to use every endeavour to ensure the success of the *Daily Herald* and to foster the establishment of local weekly newspapers throughout the country on lines which will facilitate the ultimate publication of evening newspapers in the larger industrial centres. Organisations which desire to publish newspapers should get into communication with the Joint Press Department of the Trades Union Congress and the London Party, 33 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1.

VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Labour Demands Extension.

The number of women registered as Parliamentary voters is 8,439,156. Another 5,000,000 would be added if women had the vote on the same terms as men. These 5,000,000 are now NOT CITIZENS.

By the passing of the Representation of the People Act in February, 1918, votes were conferred upon women within the following limitations:—

A woman voter must be 30 years of age, and either a Local Government elector or the wife of one.

The qualification as a Local Government elector is six months' ownership or tenancy of land or premises. Lodgers in furnished rooms are not qualified.

University franchise is obtained by a woman within the age limit of a definite standard which, in England and Wales, is the taking of a degree.

A woman is qualified to vote for a University which does not admit women to degrees if she fulfils the conditions for the admission of a man to a degree.

ADULT SUFFRAGE.—In January, 1918, at the Labour Party Annual Conference held at Nottingham, the following resolution was adopted:—

That this Conference accepts the new measure of Electoral Reform as a compromise only, and registers its opinion that no settlement will be satisfactory which does not include:—

(a) the extension of the franchise (both for Parliamentary and Local Government elections) to all adults, male and female.

A LABOUR BILL.—Early in the year 1919, the Parliamentary Labour Party introduced the *Women's Emancipation Bill*. The Bill secured a Second Reading on April 4, 1919, there voting 119 for and 32 against, and it passed through Committee stage without amendment.

Clause 2 of this Bill aimed at amending the 1918 Representation of the People Act by CONFERRING THE FRANCHISE ON WOMEN ON THE SAME TERMS AS MEN.

The Government had intimated its intention of deleting this Clause, during the debate on the Second Reading, but this was not pressed in Committee, as the majority of the Committee were so obviously in favour of its retention. In spite of the fact that the Government had opposed the Second Reading, the Bill passed through all its stages in the House of Commons.

COALITION OPPOSITION.—The following extracts from speeches of Members of the then Government and a prominent Coalition-Unionist M.P. will be of interest:—

Dr. Addison.—I know . . . that if you have an extension of the franchise now, you would before long be compelled to have a General Election . . . But I do not know that any serious-minded man will pretend, when there is a great burden of legislation already upon the House, that that is really a proposal seriously to be entertained . . . Therefore, I am sorry to say . . . that the Government cannot undertake . . . to carry through a reform and extension of the franchise under present circumstances.

Major Astor.—The Government election pledges, as the House probably knows, are to give equality in civil and judicial matters to women as compared with men . . . this is not the right time to deal again with the big question of the reform of the franchise. . . . I need not remind the House of the great difference of opinion which existed in the past on the question of women's franchise. In the opinion of the Government, this is not the opportune moment . . . to embark upon another measure which would re-open the whole question.

Mr. H. A. L. Fisher.—The Government were not prepared to consider an extension of the franchise at this juncture. When this Bill came before the Standing Committee, the Private Parliamentary Secretary reiterated that view. . . . We have been told that we must fulfil our pledge. What was the pledge? In the Coalition manifesto of November 22, 1918, it was said it would be the duty of the new Government to remove all existing inequalities of the law as between men and women. I have had opportunities of knowing what was in the minds of the Ministers who drafted that manifesto, and it was not present to their minds that this would involve the reopening of the franchise question immediately.

Sir J. D. Rees.—Everybody knows that there is not a single hon. Member here who thinks that this Bill is serious business Everybody knows to-day that it cannot become law. Could any Government, without a suicidal abdication of its duties, allow a private Bill enfranchising 5,000,000 of electors, five minutes after the General Election, to go forward—after a great advance in democratic representation had been conceded?

Having passed through all the stages in the House of Commons, however, the Bill went to the Lords, where its Second Reading was moved by Lord Kimberley on July 24, 1919.

Lord Birkenhead.—In the course of the debate thereon, the Lord Chancellor remarked:—

The noble earl (Kimberley) says this is a democratic Bill, but it adds 5,000,000 young women at this moment to the franchise. I cannot see the convenience of the course suggested by the noble earl . . . it is completely inappropriate that we should add 5,000,000 women at the present time when I believe no considerable body in the State desires that addition should be followed as it ought to be followed, by an appeal to the constituencies. So much for Clause 2 of the noble lord's Bill.

On the question being put, the motion was negatived in the Lords after a very short discussion.

In its place, the Government introduced through the House of Lords their own Sex Disqualification Bill, which was passed into law. In some ways this contained many good points, but the EQUALITY IN THE FRANCHISE WAS NOT INCLUDED—and this was the main provision of the Labour Party's Bill.

THE LABOUR BILL.

During the Session 1920, the Labour Party reintroduced their Bill under the title of the Representation of the People Bill, but with many important additions. The Bill received its Second Reading, 122 voting for and 38 against.

When it went to Standing Committee, however, the Coalition Members did everything possible to obstruct the Bill, and all sorts of amendments were moved and points of order raised. The points of order were disposed of. The next thing that happened was that Sir George Younger, supported by Sir Frederick Banbury and others, moved that the Committee adjourn, on the ground that the Bill had no chance of passing into law. The spokesman for the Government supported the motion, and to the consternation of the Labour Members, this was carried.

The Labour Members protested very vigorously against this action, claiming that the Chairman of the Committee had no right to act in this way. The duty of the Committee, where disagreement existed, was to vote out the particular clauses, and not to turn down the whole Bill. After much insistence the Labour Party were able to get the Committee to resume its work, but practically no progress was made.

During the course of the debates on this Bill, Sir George Younger said :—

If the promoter of the Bill had been a little less extreme there would be no objection to the Bill being passed.—
February 27, 1920, *House of Commons*.

On February 18, 1921, the Representation of the People Bill was again presented by Walter Smith, M.P., and supported by Mr. Clynes, Mr. Grundy, Mr. Adamson, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Spoor, Mr. Thomas Shaw and Mr. Tyson Wilson; but no progress was made.

IRELAND.

Failure of Original Coalition Policy.

"DISPERSING THE TERRORISTS."—"Before I sit down, if you will bear with me, I must say one word about one disturbed corner of the Empire. I am sure you won't guess what I am referring to. Ireland. I hope soon it will be less disturbed. There we have witnessed a spectacle of organised assassination, of the most cowardly character. Firing at men who were dressed in the garb of peaceable citizens, and who are treated as such by the officers of the law; firing from behind—cowardly murder. Unless I am mistaken, by the steps we have taken, we have murder by the throat . . . and the police are going out seeking danger in order to stamp it out. They are getting the right men. They are dispersing the terrorists."—
Mr. LLOYD GEORGE, at Guildhall, November 9, 1920.

"That there have been deplorable excesses I will not attempt to deny."—LLOYD GEORGE. *Letter to The Times*, April 20, 1921. *Reply to Bishops*.

WEEKLY CASUALTIES.—Casualties during week November 19th-26th: Killed, 36; wounded, 79. The worst week of the year. Average per week in 1920: Killed, 4; wounded, 7.

WHAT THEY SAID.—"We are simply enforcing law in Ireland, and I believe we are doing it successfully."—
LLOYD GEORGE, *House of Commons*, November 15, 1920.

"I am very glad to say that in most of the counties of Ireland things are very peaceful. Indeed, no one is in danger in Ireland who obeys the law. But in disturbed areas where soldiers and policemen are compelled to order people to halt for the purposes of search and other reasons, those who fail to halt fail at their peril."—SIR HAMAR GREENWOOD, *House of Commons*, November 17, 1920.

"I think things in Ireland are getting much better."—
LLOYD GEORGE, *House of Commons*, November 18, 1920.

"I am doing my best, and have done from the start, to prevent reprisals, and I have succeeded."—SIR HAMAR GREENWOOD, November 24, 1920.

"I have not spoken of official reprisals, which is a term I do not recognise."—Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, *House of Commons*, April 19, 1921.

"There are no 'irregular forces' of the Crown. . . . Authority for the formation of the Auxiliary Division, which is composed entirely of ex-officers of the Navy, Army and Air Force, was given on July 10, 1920, after 56 policemen, 4 soldiers and 17 civilians had been brutally assassinated, and it did not come into really effective operation until over one hundred policemen had been murdered in cold blood. . . .

"Further, it would seem to be not less clear that where, owing to intimidation and murder, the ordinary judicial processes employed in a peaceful and civilised community have failed, the police, if they are to vindicate the law and bring murderers to justice, must be armed with exceptional powers akin to those entrusted to soldiers in the field. But that there has been any authorisation or condonation of a policy of meeting murder by giving rein to unchecked violence on the other side, is utterly untrue."—AUTHORITY.

NEWSPAPER STATEMENTS.—"Houses belonging to reputed Republicans were burned in Tipperary during the early hours of yesterday morning by a number of men in civilian dress, who carried rifles. The attacks are said to be reprisals for the ambushing of a military lorry some miles from the town on Saturday last."—*Irish Independent*, April 16, 1920.

"As a result of the ambush and attack on police at Middleton and Glebe House, it was decided by the Military Governor that certain houses in the vicinity of the outrages were to be destroyed, as the inhabitants were bound to have known of the ambush and attack, and that they neglected to give any information either to the military or the police authorities."—*Daily News*, January 3, 1921.

"Five houses in Meelin (Co. Cork), at the scene of Tuesday's ambush of Crown forces, were destroyed yesterday afternoon by order of the Military Governor."—*Daily News*, January 6, 1921.

"Crown Forces bombed houses in Miltown Malbay, County Clare, yesterday, as a reprisal for the murder of Constable Moore."—*Manchester Guardian*, April 7, 1921.

THE CASUALTIES.—January, 1920–November 27th :—

	Killed.	Wounded.
Police	151	230
Soldiers	47	103
Civilians	41	101

November 27th–December 31st :—

	Killed.	Wounded.
Police	31	33
Soldiers	7	21

Total number in 1920 :—

	Killed.	Wounded.
Police	182	263
Soldiers	54	122
Civilians	203	—

—*Irish Bulletin*.

January 1st, 1921–July 12th, 1921 :—

	Killed.	Wounded.
I.R.A. and Civilians ...	707	697
Crown Forces	379	659

THE COST.—Cost of damage done by Crown Forces. From March 1st, 1916 to February 28th, 1921 :—
£107,230,000.

OUTRAGES.—Figures for outrages. January 1st, 1920–November, 27th, 1920 :—

Courthouses destroyed	67
R.I.C. barracks destroyed	528
R.I.C. barracks damaged	169
Raids on mails	830
Raids on coastguards' stations and lighthouses ...	45
Raids for arms	2,961
January 1st, 1921–July 2nd 1921 :—	
Courthouses destroyed	86
R.I.C. barracks destroyed	547
R.I.C. barracks damaged	367
Raids for arms	3,211

LABOUR POLICY.

The Conference unhesitatingly recognises the claim of the people of Ireland to Home Rule, and to self-determination in all exclusively Irish affairs.—*Labour Party Conference*, June, 1918.

The Congress once again reaffirms its belief that the only solution is self-determination, and calls upon the Government to substitute self-government for military rule.—*Trades Union Congress*, September, 1919.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.—In January, 1920, the Parliamentary Labour Party sent a "Commission of Inquiry into the present conditions in Ireland." As a result of the Inquiry they suggested the following alternatives for the settlement of the Irish question :—

(1) A full measure of Dominion Self-Government, with provision for the protection of minorities, questions of defence and foreign relations being reserved to the Imperial Parliament ; or

(2) The form of self-government should be decided upon by an Irish constituent assembly representing the whole Irish people and elected on a system of proportional representation, which would be charged with the task of drafting the new constitution and making provision for the protection of minorities, questions of defence and foreign relations being reserved to the Imperial Parliament.

Labour opposed the Government of Ireland Bill of 1920 as being unacceptable to the Irish people.

Labour strongly opposed the Restoration of Order in Ireland Bill which practically placed the whole country under martial law.

At the Annual Conference in 1920, and again in 1921, the Labour Party reaffirmed its demand that the principles of free and absolute self-determination should be applied to Ireland.

In October, 1920, Mr. Henderson moved the adjournment of the House to call attention to "the state of lawlessness in Ireland" and to the necessity for instituting an inquiry into the reprisals.

LABOUR'S CAMPAIGN.—The Government refused to set up an inquiry, and on November 16th, 1920, at a special Trades Union and Labour Party Congress, it was decided to appoint a commission to visit Ireland "in order to ascertain the truth regarding the policy and methods of the British Government." It was also decided to conduct "a great national campaign to enlighten the public on the facts of the Irish situation and to present the Labour policy outlined above."

The Commission left for Dublin on November 30th and continued their investigations until December 15th. A full report of these investigations was prepared and submitted to a special conference on December 29th. The conference was followed by a campaign throughout the country, beginning at Manchester on January 17th, and ending at the Albert Hall on February 15th. A resolution embodying the Labour Party policy was submitted to all the meetings.

Premier's Two Voices.

Undoubtedly you must restore order there, by methods very stern. You cannot permit the country to be debased into a condition of complete anarchy, where a small body of assassins, a real murder gang, are dominating the country and terrorising it, and making it impossible for reasonable men to come together to consider the best way of governing their country. — Mr. LLOYD GEORGE (*Times*, October 11, 1920).

There is the remarkable transformation in Ireland... There is the great fact that Mr. de Valera, the *chiefstain of the vast majority of the Irish race*, has been in conference for nearly three hours with the Prime Minister of this country discussing the various methods and suggestions that have been put forward for a settlement of the long, long controversy between the Irish and the British people.—Mr. LLOYD GEORGE (*Times*, July 15, 1921).

(Compare the italicised words.)

The Speakers' Handbook

Churchill's Two Voices.

We are going to break up this murder gang. That it will be broken up absolutely and utterly is as sure as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning. It was said that that might be avoided if they would only adopt a reasonable and sympathetic attitude towards Ireland.—Mr. CHURCHILL, at Dundee, October 16, 1920

Nor was the movement of the rebels quelled. On the contrary, it attained larger proportions every week. . . . There was bloodshed on a larger scale. The gaols are filled with Irish convicts. . . . Four thousand interned persons, against whom there was no evidence, and no means of formulating a charge, were wired in compounds all over the country. . . . Official reprisals were instituted under martial law. . . . It is high time that the main body of Irish and British opinion asserted its determination to put a stop to these fanatical quarrels.—Mr. CHURCHILL, House of Commons, December 15, 1921.

Offer of Peace.

I am glad that the people of Britain have . . . said: "Let us settle this old trouble." And when we have proposed terms that have never been proposed before by any English statesman to Ireland, I am glad to speak in the name of Britain when we are making this offer.—Mr. LLOYD GEORGE (*Times*, August 29, 1921).

. . . A peace which brought a new accession of strength to this great Empire, by bringing to its side a gifted and gallant people who for centuries have been at feud with it, and by removing from the path of Empire a peril that always beset it in the hour of our deepest perplexity, and by adding a brilliant chaplet to the renown which the Empire won throughout the world as the one Empire that has found the wisdom and the way of transfusing freedom into power.—Mr. LLOYD GEORGE, House of Commons, October 31, 1921.

Mr. Devlin's Tribute to Labour.

Speaking in the House of Commons on February 16, 1922, Mr. Devlin, after thanking various Members of Parliament for helping to rouse the moral conscience of the British nation, went on to say:

"I would be very sorry as an Irishman to allow this occasion to pass without paying due tribute to them and to many distinguished members of the Labour Party who went to Ireland, and who together contributed very largely to this settlement."

INDIA.

Labour welcomed the announcement of August, 1917, in which the Government declared its aim in India to be "the progressive realisation of responsible self-government."

When, in 1919, the Government of India Bill was introduced, the Labour Party, after using every effort to strengthen its provision and to make it a complete fulfilment of the Government's pledge, gave to the measure a general support. The Party regarded the Bill as, at all events, a step in the right direction.

REFORMS IMPERILLED.—Unhappily, before the Act became operative, two things occurred which seriously prejudiced the prospects of an amicable understanding with the Indian people and threatened to make the working of the Reforms impossible.

The massacre of unarmed Indians by the British at Amritsar roused Hindu hostility as it had never been aroused before.

The signing of the Turkish Peace Treaty, a Treaty which Mohammedans everywhere believed struck a fatal blow at the prestige of their faith, united Moslem opinion in a passionate hatred of the British Government.

In a word, the confidence of India in Britain was lost. The extreme elements in Indian Nationalism were stimulated. Hindu-Moslem unity was strengthened, and Mr. Gandhi became the unchallenged leader of revolt against British rule.

The recent action of the Government of India in reverting to the old methods of repression and imprisoning hundreds of Indians has had the effect (as repressive action inevitably has) of still further consolidating Mr. Gandhi's position. Whilst it is true that a considerable body of moderate opinion in India is still convinced that connection with Britain must be maintained, that body of opinion is daily being crushed by the unwise use of coercive power.

LABOUR'S VIEW.—The British Labour Party has always recognised and fought for India's right to complete self-government. In the resolution affirming this, which was unanimously carried at the Conference at Scarborough in June, 1920, hope was expressed that all the peoples of the British Empire would prefer to remain as parts of that Empire so soon as their aspirations had been dealt with in a thoroughly conciliatory manner by the granting of adequate measures of autonomy. At the same time, the resolution declared that the final decision must rest with these peoples themselves.

Another declaration of Labour opinion upon the present situation in India was made in February, 1922, by the National Joint Council, representing the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, the Parliamentary Labour Party, and the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party.

While realising the necessity of preserving order in India, the Council deplored the political arrests that have taken place and the "blood and iron" policy which the recent speech of the Prime Minister seems to foreshadow.

The Council deplored no less the action of the Non-Co-operators in boycotting those Parliamentary institutions

The Speakers' Handbook

recently conferred upon India, by means of which grievances should be ventilated and wrongs redressed.

As it is the settled policy of Great Britain (under the Government of India Act, 1920) to place India, as soon as may be, in the position of a self-governing Dominion, and in order to re-establish good relations between the peoples, the Council urged both Indian democrats and H.M. Government to join in a conference, composed of all shades of political thought, to consider the possibilities of a peace based upon

- (1) An amnesty;
 - (2) The dropping of the practice of non-co-operation;
 - (3) A time limit for the transition stages of partial self-government; and
 - (4) Fresh elections, at least to the Legislative Assembly.
- Unless there is a radical change in our attitude and policy, India will be lost to the British Commonwealth.

EGYPT.

BEFORE THE WAR.—In 1882, Great Britain intervened in Egypt to restore order during the Arabi rebellion. Order was restored. In 1887, we actually agreed to terminate the occupation. Nevertheless, the British Army of Occupation remained and still remains in Egypt.

In theory, the national status of the country until 1914 was that of an *autonomous nationality* under the Suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey. In virtue of the British Army of Occupation, however, the British representative came to be the *real arbiter* of the country.

OUR PLEDGES TO EGYPT.—"The Egyptian Nationalists are able to point to a long series of declarations by British statesmen disowning the idea of annexing or even permanently occupying the country, and affirming, in the words of Sir Eldon Gorst, 'that the fundamental idea of the British Government has been to prepare Egyptians for self-government, while helping them in the meantime to enjoy the benefit of a good government.'—*Milner Report*.

Then the war came. Egypt was proclaimed to be a British protectorate. Anti-British sentiment gathered strength, and spread from the educated classes to the hitherto contented peasants.

COALITION IN EGYPT.

After the war, not only the Egyptian Nationalists, but even moderate opinion in Egypt began to urge that the time had come to assert a claim for self-government consistent with the repeated declarations of British statesmen and the principles enunciated by President Wilson and approved by the Allies.—*Milner Report*.

POLICY OF CONTEMPT.—In November, 1918, the Egyptian Ministers desired to come to London to discuss the affairs of Egypt; Coalition Ministers had neither time nor attention to give to the Egyptian Ministers. Our representative in Egypt appealed for their reception; his advice was rejected by the Coalition, and the Prime Minister of Egypt resigned.

"The result of these events was that a number of the Moderate Party joined the advanced Nationalists, who now advocated a more far-reaching policy, while their agents initiated a violent anti-British campaign throughout the country. . . ."—*Milner Report*.

POLICY OF VIOLENCE.—An Egyptian delegation ("Wafd") was constituted under the Chairmanship of Zaghlul Pasha to lay the legitimate aspirations of Egypt before their country. On March 3rd, 1919, this delegation presented a petition to the Sultan. This proceeding was taken to be a challenge by the Coalition, and Zaghlul Pasha, with three of his most active adherents, were deported to Malta.

This gave rise to agitation, protests, demonstrations, disturbances, etc.

"Within a week . . . a movement anti-British and even anti-European had assumed grave proportions."—*Milner Report*.

Military measures rendered the situation outwardly calm.

POLICY OF CONCILIATION.—Lord Allenby, who had been Commander-in-Chief in Egypt, returned to Egypt on March 25th, 1919, as Special High Commissioner.

A general strike broke out on April 2nd. but in pursuance of a policy of conciliation, *Zaghlul Pasha and his associates were released from Malta within a month of their deportation.*

Punitive measures for acts committed during the disturbances prolonged the period of exasperation.

Zaghlul Pasha proceeded to Paris in the hope of obtaining a hearing from the Paris Conference, but failed to achieve his object.

THE MILNER MISSION.

By this time it had been announced (May, 1919) that a special mission under the chairmanship of Lord Milner would proceed to Egypt in the autumn. The mission reached Egypt early in December, 1919, and was immediately struck by the existence of a widespread belief that the object of its coming was the extinction of Egyptian nationality.

After many months the mission were able to come into direct contact with the chief exponents of Egyptian opinion, including Zaghlul Pasha, with whom the mission conferred in London.

The above notes are based upon the report of the mission which was presented in December, 1920.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE MILNER MISSION.

The report of the Milner Mission upon the political status of Egypt includes the following observations:—

No man of standing in Egypt would have dared to say to them that he was not in favour of "complete independence." . . . "To all outward appearance, independent opinion was solidly nationalist. And, in our judgment, is likely to remain so."

The remarkable organisation known as the *Wafd* (Delegation) under the leadership of Zaghlul Pasha . . . which claims, "*not without many credentials,*" to speak in the name of "the nation," *does not consist merely of extreme men.*

"We have constantly renewed our promise of self-government for Egypt. We are of opinion that the fulfilment of this promise cannot be postponed. The spirit of Egyptian nationalism cannot be extinguished, and, though it may always be possible to suppress its more violent manifestations, the government of the country in the teeth of a hostile people, who charge us with breach of faith, must be a difficult and distasteful task."

"We gradually came to the conclusion that no settlement could be satisfactory which was simply imposed by Great Britain upon Egypt, but that it would be wiser to seek a solution by means of a bilateral agreement—a Treaty—between the two countries."

It had always been a fundamental point in our plan that the Treaty should not be allowed to come into force unless it has been approved by a genuinely representative Egyptian Assembly. . . . "In any such Assembly, we were assured on all hands, Zaghlul Pasha and his associates would command a substantial, if not an overwhelming majority."

The maintenance of internal order was a matter for the Egyptians themselves. The Egyptians should confer on Great Britain by Treaty the right to maintain a military force on Egyptian soil for the protection of her Imperial communications. The Treaty should fix the place where the forces shall be quartered.

Draft terms of a proposed settlement which would "establish the independence of Egypt on a secure and lasting basis" were drafted by the mission and taken to Egypt by the Egyptian Delegation. They were well received by the Egyptian public.

NEGOTIATIONS PLUS FORCE.—In a resolution adopted by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party it was pointed out that:—

"It was incumbent upon the Government to take immediate steps to act upon the report of this Mission and to establish Egyptian independence through a treaty negotiated between itself and a duly elected Government of the Egyptian people. It did nothing of the sort.

"After long delay, which naturally made British intentions suspect and played into the hands of Egyptian extremists, it at last entered into negotiations with the Ministry of Adly Pasha. As soon as these negotiations began, it was clear that no real independence was to be offered to Egypt; the army of occupation was to remain in Egypt; the power of the Egyptians to control their foreign relations was reduced to a shadow; Judicial and Financial Commissioners were to be given wide powers of interference in the internal administration.

Failure of Coalition Policy.

"Even so moderate a politician as Adly Pasha, who was friendly in every way to British Government, refused to agree to these proposals and resigned.

"There is now no Egyptian of any power or repute who will even form a Government in Egypt. The British Government has, therefore, once more had to resort to a military Government and extreme forms of repression, and the natural result has been a recrudescence of riots and violent reaction against British rule."

The British had again deported Zaghlul Pasha.

LABOUR POLICY.

Justice and Reconciliation.

The Labour Party protested against this deportation as a challenge to the right of the Egyptian people even to express their national aspirations. It was futile, they said, because in Egypt as in Ireland, the oppression of nationalist leaders by the foreigner stimulates nationalist feeling.

The resolution concluded by saying that the Labour Party also protested "against the whole policy of the Government, which is necessarily regarded by Egypt as a breach of faith."

It demanded "that the Government should carry out the recommendations of Lord Milner's Commission. This can only be done," the resolution stated,

"by doing in Egypt what the Government was at last forced to do in Ireland. The Egyptians should be given a full and free opportunity to elect a Government to represent them and a treaty should be negotiated with that Government 'in order to establish the independence of Egypt on a secure and lasting basis.'"

The Present Position.

In February, 1922, the Protectorate was terminated, and Egypt was declared to be an independent sovereign State. But the British military occupation of Egypt continued, and important Egyptian Nationalist leaders remained exiles. Whether Sarwat Pasha, and not Zaghlul Pasha, speaks for the Egyptian people will only be determined when martial law has been withdrawn, the political banishments annulled, and free and unrestricted discussion of the national issues by all Egyptian parties precedes the democratic election of a new Egyptian Government. When elections have taken place under these conditions, the British Government will be in a position to negotiate a treaty of peace and amity with the chosen representatives of the Egyptian people.

The Speakers' Handbook

OUR ARMY IN EGYPT.

The Point at Issue.

The Milner Mission proposed to the Coalition that the Treaty should fix the place where the army shall be quartered. The presence of this force should not constitute in any manner a military occupation of the country or prejudice the rights of the Government of Egypt.

The Coalition proposed to the Egyptians that the British Forces "should be maintained at such places in Egypt and for such periods as would from time to time be determined. They shall also at all times have facilities as at present for the acquisition and use of barracks, exercise grounds, aerodromes, naval yards and naval bases."

The Egyptian (Adly Pasha) Delegation replied: "The draft confers on Great Britain the right to maintain military forces at all times on any part of Egyptian territory, and places at her disposition all the ways and means of communication in the country. This constitutes occupation pure and simple, and destroys every idea of independence and suppresses even internal sovereignty."

"In the past, military occupation, although it had only a temporary character, sufficed to guarantee to Great Britain absolute control over the whole administration without the need of any textual treaty or any definition of power whatever."

It is freely stated that it was the point of view of the British War Office which prevailed in the negotiations with Adly Pasha, and that the military question is the question of capital importance upon which negotiations really broke down.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL'S PART.—Sir Valentine Chirol stated in *The Times*, Dec. 29, 1921:

"I passed through Egypt in April last, just a week after Mr. Winston Churchill had been holding his Middle Eastern Conference in Cairo, and though it was not concerned in any way with the Egyptian question, he had scarcely disguised, I was told, in conversations even with Egyptian Ministers, his contempt for the Milner Commission's report or his own very different view that Egypt must be treated for all intents and purposes as part and parcel of the British Empire, and as a great British place of arms."

COALITION ATROCITIES IN EGYPT.—The following notice under martial law was posted up in Suez:

"If aeroplanes perceive an assembly they will drop smoke bombs; if the assembly does not disperse, they will drop shells and open fire with their machine guns."—(*Daily Chronicle*, Dec. 29, 1921.)

A MODERATE'S QUESTIONS.—Sir Valentine Chirol has put the following questions about our policy in Egypt: Will the crop of hatred which we are sowing tend even to the security of our Imperial communications, should they ever be menaced again as they were in 1915 . . . ?

We are treating a great Mahomedan country like Egypt as a conquered country. Will that help us to reconcile the Jews and Arabs in Palestine? Will it help us in Mesopotamia or in Turkey? Will it help to disarm Mahomedan hostility in India?

Is it likely to pay from the point of view of the British taxpayers, who will sooner or later have to foot the bill for our army of occupation and for our warships hurriedly concentrated in Egyptian waters?

Will it pay from the point of view of economic reconstruction to disturb once more the prospects of reviving trade in one of our chief surviving Mediterranean markets?—*The Times*, Dec. 29, 1921.

[References: Report of the Special Milner Commission to Egypt. Cmd. 1531. 6d. Papers respecting Negotiations with the Egyptian Delegation. Cmd. 1555. 6d.]

RUSSIA.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND RUSSIA.—No small part of the unemployment which now prevails in this country is due to the interruption of our trade with Russia. Russia is the natural granary of Europe; before the war one-eighth of our imported wheat supplies came from Russia. We also imported from Russia great quantities of other foodstuffs, such as oats and barley, dairy produce and eggs; and also great quantities of raw materials, such as timber, tallow, leather, hemp and flax, amounting in value in 1913 to £38,000,000. These imports were paid for by exporting manufactured goods and coal. In 1913 we exported £18,000,000 worth of goods to Russia. At present our exports to Russia are only one-quarter of the pre-war total. And, therefore, men who produce goods for export to Russia are standing idle.

Labour's economic policy with regard to Russia is based upon two facts. Firstly, Russia is potentially Europe's largest granary, and the greatest market in Europe for the purchase of manufactured articles. Secondly, all the countries of Europe are economically interdependent. Russia was the principal customer of Germany before the war, whilst Germany was our principal European customer, and Russia was becoming the chief source of our supply of cereals. These facts cannot be dissociated. It will be quite impossible for Germany to make any substantial contribution towards her reparation obligations until the economic relations between Russia and Germany have been re-established. Moreover, the maintenance of a regular and sufficient food supply for the United Kingdom will depend more and more upon the prosperity of Russian agriculture.

COALITION POLICY.—The British Government has made every possible mistake in regard to Russia. It ignored for years what ought to have been the main object of its Russian policy—the restoration of commercial relations; it has pursued a most mischievous aim—the restoration of the old social system in Russia; it has used most reprehensible means in pursuing this aim; it has failed in its efforts; its stupidity and incompetence have alienated the sympathies of its friends, and the respect of its opponents. The Coalition spokesmen have never said what sort of Government they wish to see established in Russia; but, to judge from their actions, they favour some sort of monarchy, or, at any rate, some sort of reactionary system. The military adventurers whom they have supported—Judenitch, Koltchak, Denikin, and Wrangel—were all pronounced reactionaries.

BRUTAL AND ILLEGAL.—In its measures against the Russian Revolution our Government has violated all the conventions, and even the definite rules, which regulate the conduct of civilised States. From 1917 to 1921 they imposed a blockade upon Russia without any declaration of war or any shadow of international right. They took the monstrous step of preventing neutral countries, such as Sweden, from trading with Russia. The loss and suffering which this caused to the Russian population were, of course, deeply resented; and the illegality of the whole proceeding has caused the deepest indignation.

MISCALCULATIONS.—This Russian policy has failed most ignominiously. Russian Socialism is essentially a system of ideas, and can never be suppressed by force of arms, least of all by the arms of an alien invader.

Our Government allowed itself to be grossly misled as to the character of the "White" forces under Judenitch, Denikin, and the rest, to whom it gave assistance in Russia. The officers of the "White" armies were utterly incompetent, corrupt and reactionary; while the rank and file were of the poorest quality, destitute of zeal and fighting ability. Such armies never had any chance of success, and, if they had succeeded, the results would have been disastrous to Russia. A little judicious inquiry would have informed our Government of these facts, and have saved a vast expenditure of money, great loss of life, and a long interruption to our trade.

For Reaction the Government was willing to pay immense amounts; but for the famine relief in Russia it could only afford £200,000.

LLOYD GEORGE ON RUSSIA.—The opportunism and inconsistency of Lloyd George have been strikingly displayed in regard to Russia. The present system of government was established in Russia in the autumn of 1917, and at once began negotiations for peace with Germany. Such a peace was rendered indispensable by the temper of the Russian people, but it was an unpardonable offence in the eyes of our Government. The Soviet Government was, in the beginning of 1918, at least as well established as any Government in Russia since the abdication of the Czar in March, 1917. But in June, 1918, Lloyd George denied that any responsible Government whatever existed in the country. (House of Commons, June 24, 1918). He reiterated this statement a few months later. He said "Russia has broken into a number of confused and ill-defined entities. There is no *de jure* Government there." (House of Commons, August 7, 1918). By the spring of 1919 the Soviet Government was firmly established; but Lloyd George still continued to deny its existence. "There is no body which can say it is a *de facto* Government for the whole of Russia." (House of Commons, April 16, 1919). Very different was his attitude to Koltchak and Denikin. He said, indeed, that there had been no formal recognition of their authority; but added, "We treated them as *de facto* Governments within the areas occupied by them." (House of Commons, December 4, 1919). Now, can anyone maintain that Koltchak and Denikin had more authority over the vast areas, which they hastily overran, than the Soviet Government, whose centre was Moscow? This attitude of non-recognition was not changed till the summer of 1920. On June 7 Lloyd George announced a decision arrived at by the Allied Powers in conference at San Remo to resume commercial and diplomatic relations with Russia. In the spring of 1921, in reference to the Russian Trade Agreement, he spoke of "recognising the Soviet Government as the *de facto* Government of Russia, which undoubtedly it is." (House of Commons, March 22, 1921). It is excellent that Lloyd George should at last have come to recognise a plain fact. But it would have saved great loss and suffering, both to Britain and to Russia, if he had recognised it at least three years before.

Lloyd George's change of view in regard to Russia has been due partly to the pressure of the British Labour Party, partly to the failure of the attempts which the Coalition has made to break Bolshevism by blockade and armed force. Lloyd George has always expressed violent antipathy to the present Russian Government. "Bolshevism is the poison of production" (December 6, 1918). "We disagree fundamentally with all the principles upon which the present Russian experiment is based" (April 16, 1919). "The chariot of Bolshevism is drawn by plunder and terror" (November 17, 1919). "The horrors of Bolshevism have revolted the conscience of mankind"

(February 10, 1920). Some evil deeds have been committed by the Russian Bolsheviks, certainly, but of trifling extent compared with those of the old system; and for many of them we ourselves and the "White" reactionaries are indirectly responsible by exasperating Russian public feeling. However, Lloyd George has now consented to overlook everything for the sake of resuming trade.

OUR BLOCKADE OF RUSSIA.—All the evils that have befallen Russia during the last four and a half years—the cruelties, famine, internecine hatred—have been rendered worse by the British blockade. No one who has not lived in a blockaded country can understand the suffering and exasperation which a blockade causes. Russia is peculiarly susceptible to it, because she has always been so greatly dependent upon imported manufactures. The mission of the Labour Party to Russia in 1920 heard bitter complaints everywhere of the severity of the blockade. It caused scarcity in the people's houses of all Colonial produce (such as tea, coffee, cotton and vegetable oil) of all manufactured goods, including those which are made of metal; it hindered agriculture by restricting the supply of cultivating tools and machinery, and it paralysed transport by cutting off supplies of coal and material for repair of railways and rolling stock. The sufferings thus caused will long be a cause of bitter feeling against England.

EXPEDITIONS AGAINST RUSSIA.—The various expeditions which we have undertaken against the Bolsheviks are among the most futile and expensive adventures ever undertaken by the British Government. They have largely escaped the censure which they deserve. Our expenditure has amounted to a figure between £50,000,000 and £60,000,000; our troops have suffered severely, not only in casualties, but in exposure to the severe Russian cold. The whole series of operations has ended in absolute and total failure. They ought never to have been undertaken. On this account, if for no other, the Coalition Government should be ignominiously dismissed from office. It is credibly asserted that the prime mover in these follies is Winston Churchill, who has asserted so loudly that "Labour cannot govern." Does Churchill offer his Russian record to the world as a sample of his governing power?

MURMANSK AND ARCHANGEL.—The most important of "Churchill's little wars" is that of North Russia, the official story of which is told in a Blue Book issued by our War Office (Cmd. 818, 1920). It is a dismal story, because it shows our brave soldiers in Russia, exposed to great hardship and danger, fighting for a cause which they plainly saw to be unjust, and hampered "by the absence of any clearly-defined policy on the part of the Allied Governments." (Memo. by Sir Henry Wilson). The expedition was begun on a very small scale in April, 1918, with a landing at Murmansk, to protect that port against the Germans, and was subsequently extended to Archangel to protect the magazine of stores accumulated there. On the conclusion of the Armistice the British troops should have been withdrawn without delay. Instead of this, they were reinforced and used to attack the army of the Soviet Government, in concert with reactionary Russian forces in the neighbourhood. The operations ended in failure, not from any fault of our troops, but because local feeling was against reaction. Russian and Finnish regiments in the British service mutinied and shot their officers: the attitude of the population became increasingly hostile. Nothing was left but to withdraw our troops, and evacuate the Russians who

had sympathised with them. This was completed in October 1919.

PRINKIPO.—The inconsistency and wavering of the Coalition Government is shown by the Prinkipo proposal. This was an invitation to all the warring Russian parties to send representatives to the Island of Prinkipo, near Constantinople, to confer with representatives of the Allied Powers as to the future of Russia. The Soviet Government responded favourably; but all the reactionary elements throughout Europe denounced the proposal, and it was dropped. Such newspapers as the *Times* still use the word "Prinkipo" as a standing taunt against the less reactionary members of the Coalition Government.

KOLTCHAK.—The most dangerous enemy of the Soviet Government in its early period was Admiral Koltchak. He had seized the Government of Siberia in November, 1917, made himself master of the whole country, and advanced into European Russia with the intention of joining hands with the British forces at Archangel. It was impossible for the British to help him with troops, but he received every moral encouragement, and a British mission was present with his army. But, under the influence of the strong national feeling roused by these various attacks upon Russia, the Soviet Government rallied its forces, and Koltchak was driven back into Siberia, and his forces utterly destroyed early in 1920.

DENIKIN.—The experiences in North Russia ought to have convinced our Government that no further effort ought to be given to the reactionaries who were attacking the Soviet Government. In spite of this, however, great assistance was given to General Denikin in South Russia in the form of cash, stores, and contingents of special forces, such as "tanks." Denikin was no more successful than Koltchak; he advanced rapidly, committing many barbarous severities against the Soviet troops who fell into his hands. With success the reactionary character of his movement became manifest; the inhabitants of the districts which he had overrun turned against him as he had passed; and the Soviet forces, full of enthusiasm to defend their newly-won freedom, were able easily to drive him back towards the Crimea. His enterprise finally ended in January, 1920. What remained of his force joined itself to a similar adventurer—General Wrangel.

WRANGEL.—The history of General Wrangel is closely parallel to that of his predecessors. Some success at first, and then failure when the Soviet forces attacked in earnest. The support by the Allies to Wrangel was utterly inexcusable. Our Navy helped to carry over the remnants of Denikin's army from the North Caucasus to Wrangel in the Crimea. He was supplied with the British munitions originally intended for Denikin. A British air service detachment and a numerous "mission" assisted him; while French engineers fortified the neck of the peninsula for him. Wrangel failed like Denikin, and for similar reasons. He was finally defeated in November, 1920.

POLAND.—Intense indignation was caused in Russia by a most unprovoked attack by Poland in 1920. Since the war Poland has fallen under the influence of a violent militant party. In alliance with a South Russian adventurer—General Petlura—the Poles laid claim to the whole of Russian territory West of the Dnieper, including the great city of Kieff; and then proceeded to invade the Ukraine. How far the Allies jointly authorised this adventure is not certain. The Polish Ministers have always asserted that, during the meeting of the Supreme Council at San Remo, they were authorised, and even

encouraged, to make their attack. That was admittedly the French attitude, and the French military mission in Poland, which numbered over 700 officers, organised the whole campaign. Bonar Law has denied that the British Government gave any positive encouragement to the Poles. Winston Churchill, however, admittedly sent munitions, and a glowing telegram of congratulation from King George was sent to the Polish Marshal, Pilsudski, after his first victories. This most unjust and unnecessary war ought to have been stopped by the League of Nations. The League, however, took no action, though its duty to do so is clearly laid down in the Covenant. Lord Curzon refused to set the League's machinery of conciliation in motion, though cogent and timely appeals were made to him, not only by the Labour Party, but also by Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Asquith.

The successes of the Poles were short lived; the Coalition Government soon had cause to repent its telegram to Pilsudski. The Soviet Government, which had been taken by surprise by the Polish aggression, mobilised its forces, drove the Poles out of the Ukraine, and invading Poland in their turn, nearly captured Warsaw. When the Poles were successful our Foreign Minister, Lord Curzon, did nothing; when the Poles were worsted Lord Curzon intervened to protect them. He insisted that the independence of Poland must be maintained. Lloyd George publicly threatened war. Our Baltic Fleet was set in motion. At Danzig, where the German dockers had struck to prevent the landing of munitions for the Poles, British soldiers were used to unload them.

The conduct of the Poles, and of the British and French in supporting them, was resented by Labour all over Europe. On May 10 British dockers refused to load the ship *Jolly George*, which was to convey munitions for the Poles. In August, after Lloyd George's threat of war, a Conference representing British Labour, and meeting at the House of Commons, passed a resolution threatening "direct action" on the part of Labour if war were declared by the Allied Powers against Russia on the issue of Poland. This threat was effective. Eventually peace was concluded between Russia and Poland in the autumn of 1920.

LABOUR POLICY.

Labour has made many protests against the attitude of the Coalition Government towards Russia as set out above, the latest being that contained in a memorandum submitted on December 17, 1921, by the Labour Party to the Prime Minister prior to the Cannes Conference:

To sum up we suggest for Russia:—

- (a) As a matter of urgency, further relief credits in cash or kind.
- (b) The full official recognition of the Soviet Government.
- (c) As an item in the general European settlement, some credit arrangement, in the form of a reconstruction loan to Russia, which will enable her to obtain railway material and machinery for the restoration of her agriculture.
- (d) The extension of the general trade credit scheme to Russia, in order to foster the export of British manufactured goods.

MESOPOTAMIA.

"Oil in Mosul."

The central fact about Mesopotamia is that we took it for its oil. The responsibility belongs no less to the Independent Liberals (Mr. Asquith and Earl Grey) than to the Coalition, for it was assigned to us in the Secret Treaties.

A very doubtful strategical case can be put up, but it applies only to the coast, and not to the interior.

But the best oil is in the far interior, at Mosul. To hold that is manifestly to incur the gravest military risks.

THE SACRED TRUST.—In creating the system of mandates to be fulfilled "as a sacred trust of civilisation," the victors laid it down in the Covenant of the League of Nations that "the wishes of these (native) communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory. . . ."

CONSULTING THE PEOPLE.—The wishes of the people of Mesopotamia were no more consulted when we assigned the mandate to ourselves than they were when the Secret Treaty was drafted. What they were may be inferred from the fact that long after the armistice we had to keep a garrison of 220,000 men to hold down a population of 2,000,000, including women, children and "friendlies." A very formidable "rebellion" cost us £20,000,000 to suppress.

When we captured Bagdad, we promised its people not to impose "alien institutions," but to promote "institutions which are in consonance with their sacred laws and their racial ideal" (Sir Stanley Maude's proclamation). What we actually did was to set up an administration on the Anglo-Indian pattern. An official return (September, 1920) showed that of the officials receiving more than £45 a month 507 were British, 7 Indians, and 20 Arabs. If ever the oil wells and irrigable fields are developed it will have to be by immigrant labour with results fatal to the "racial ideals" of the Arabs.

COUNTING THE COST.—The cost to us of this administration in 1919-20 was over £70,000,000.

In 1920-21 it was about £40,000,000. In 1921-22 it still stood as high as £27,000,000. That gives a total of over £137,000,000. Mr. Churchill has pointed out that this includes the cost of bringing home the troops. Even so, it is not less than £100,000,000—about the same figure as our expenditure on intervention in Russia.

CHOOSING A KING.—After a riot of extravagance this Anglo-Indian system was scrapped—more or less, under the influence of rebellion there and criticism here. The Coalition gave a "coupon" to the Emir Feisal (whom the French had deposed when we made him King of Damascus), and only procured his "election" with our army standing round and our aeroplanes overhead, as King of Mesopotamia. The event will show him how far he can maintain himself if we reduce the garrison. His fate seems to depend on the loyalty of the head of his native army, one Jaapar Pasha, a gentleman who was twice decorated in the late war—once with the German Iron Cross and once with the British Order of St. Michael and St. George.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATION.—Apart from the objections based on cost, risk and native rights, our conquest of Mesopotamia has exposed us to many international jealousies—partly from the American oil interest, but chiefly from the French, who also claimed Mosul, for in one of the several contradictory versions of the Secret Agreements it had been assigned to them. They have now in their separate Treaty with the Angora Turks restored to them the Bagdad Railway, with a strip of territory leading conveniently to the edge of our zone.

WHO BENEFITS?—Mesopotamia is certainly rich in complications, but many experts regard the oil as unworkable. If ever the lavish expenditure of the taxpayers' money does enable the oil syndicate to show a profit, how much of it is likely to go either to the British Treasury or to the people of Mesopotamia? We conquer and hold and defend the oil well. Capital will tap it.

SOME COLONIAL FACTS.

MANDATES—PROMISES.—In 1918 President Wilson advanced the doctrine of treating backward countries as sacred trusts of civilisation.

"When you come to settle who shall be the future trustees of these uncivilised lands, you must take into account the sentiments of the people themselves. . . . The wishes, the desires, and the interests of the people of those countries must be the dominant factor in settling their future government. That is the principle upon which we are proceeding."

—(MR. LLOYD GEORGE, *House of Commons*,
December 21, 1917.)

* * *

"The governing consideration . . . must be that the inhabitants should be placed under the control of an administration, acceptable to themselves, one of whose main purposes will be to prevent their exploitation for the benefit of European capitalists of Governments. . . . The natives live under chiefs and councils who are competent to consult and speak for their tribes and members. . . . The general principle of national self-determination is, therefore, as applicable in their cases as in those of occupied European territories."

MR. LLOYD GEORGE, *Speech on "The Nation's War Aims" to Trade Union delegates*.
January 5, 1918.

* * *

The public of Europe and America believed these promises; so, unfortunately, did the people of the territories most concerned.

What has happened?

MANDATES—PERFORMANCE.—More than three years have passed, and no official Mandates have yet been issued for the Mandated areas of Central Africa, or for ex-Turkish territories; although draft Mandates have been issued by the British Government.

The tortured Armenian race has been betrayed and abandoned.

No attempt has ever been made to carry out the pledges so solemnly and emphatically given by Mr. Lloyd George. The natives of these territories did not choose their Mandatories; they were chosen for them by the Supreme Council at San Remo in 1919. Not only has no effort been made to ascertain native wishes, but in several cases tribes and people have passionately protested against being forced, under certain Mandatory Powers, in violation of native rights and native desires. Not only so, but the lines of demarcation have been drawn in such a way that, in certain places, tribes and families have been bi-sectioned and placed under two separate Mandatories.

According to the Covenant, the natives of Central Africa were not to be militarised. In the French draft Mandate a clause has been inserted, said to be due to a secret agreement between Mr. Lloyd George, President Wilson and the French Government, whereby France can, in the event of European war, bring the natives of Africa overseas to fight for her.

Such abuses as the sale of alcohol, and the slave trade (and presumably, therefore, slavery) were to be prohibited. In the Tanganyika Mandated territories under Great Britain and Belgium, there are to-day over 100,000 slaves,

and no proclamation has yet been issued giving liberty to those men and women held in bondage. In French Mandated territories alcohol is being sold in enormous quantities. In the Mandated area of Samoa Chinese indentured labour is being maintained and extended. The form of this labour is, in several respects, worse than the indentured coolie labour of South Africa, which Mr. Churchill was so prominent in denouncing.

IN BRITISH DEPENDENCIES.—The doctrine of trusteeship advanced by President Wilson for the Mandated areas is no new one. It has always been advanced as the theoretic relationship between the Mother country of Great Britain and her overseas dependencies. The main principles of this term "trusteeship" follow those of trusteeship in civil life, namely, that it is the first duty of the trustee to seek the welfare of the ward.

How has the Coalition respected this?

PALM KERNELS.

After the 1918 election a policy was deliberately conceived and applied with the object of smashing the Continental margarine and vegetable oil trade. This was to be done by inflicting upon the native producers in West Africa a differential duty of £2 per ton on all their produce, unless they sent this oil produce to factories domiciled in British territory. In effect this was a subsidy to certain British manufacturers. The results of this policy have been disastrous. The first result has been practically to destroy the export trade between West Africa and the Continent of Europe. This, in turn, has reduced to a comparatively negligible quantity the export of British manufactured goods to West Africa, thereby gravely accentuating unemployment in Lancashire, Yorkshire and the Midlands. Mr. Lever, son of Lord Leverhulme, has recently pointed out, in a speech criticising the Colonial Office, that our reactionary policy in West Africa means that the native in British territory cannot sell his oil kernels on the Continent of Europe because he is burdened with £9 per ton overhead charges, whereas other nations impose only about £5 per ton.

FORCED LABOUR.

After the 1918 election, with the support of Lord Milner and Colonel Amery, an Ordinance was introduced into East Africa, under which every native, who could not show that he had worked for wages, could be conscripted for forced labour for 60 days a year, in addition to another Ordinance which would call him out for 24 days a year, making in all 84 days a year. The Labour and Liberal parties, and individual Conservatives like Lord Henry Bentinck and Major Ormsby Gore, fought this Ordinance in the House of Commons, until Mr. Winston Churchill agreed to an amending Ordinance, but this amended Ordinance has never yet been produced.

LAND ROBBERY.

Within recent years—and the process is continuing—natives are being removed from their tribal lands in enormous numbers. In the territories of Southern Rhodesia controlled by the Chartered Company, not one native now owns by any indigenous right he can defend in the Courts a single acre of land, nor does he own his kraals, his gardens, springs or graveyards, nor even the ground on which his hut is erected. Subject to the Government being satisfied that a good case is made out, a native can be removed either from the Reserves or any other land occupied by him. A similar proceeding is threatened in Northern Rhodesia.

LABOUR POLICY.

The Labour Party holds to the view that the main principle of relationship to backward peoples should be that of trusteeship, and that this should be honestly applied in seeking first the welfare of the inhabitants of the territories, and not in exploitation. We believe in free labour, free trade, free expression of opinion, no secret deportations, the right of the natives of these territories to be tried in open Court and defended by counsel; the abolition of whipping and other criminal penalties for breaches of civil contracts; the reaffirmation of the total abolition of every form of slavery; with the right of every man to rise to any position to which his talent may fit him—either in industry or State. The Coalition has violated every one of these principles during the period of its existence.

SELF-DETERMINATION.

Both during the war and during the period of negotiation following the war, no principle was more strongly advocated by British and American statesmen than that of self-determination.

President Wilson.—It was admirably expressed by President Wilson in his address to Congress of February 11, 1918:

"Peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were chattels and pawns in a game. Every territorial settlement must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims among rival States."

Mr. Lloyd George.—None of our leading statesmen has challenged the principle. Lloyd George has advocated it most emphatically. He has said:

"The wishes, the desires, and the interests of the people of a country must be the dominant factor in settling its future government."—(*Speech of December 21, 1917, in House of Commons.*)

Later he said:

"Government with the consent of the governed must be the basis of any territorial settlement in this war."—(*Speech of January 5, 1918, in London.*)

And in the same speech there is strong insistence upon "the general principle of national self-determination."

Mr. Asquith has spoken in the same terms:

"The governing principle is one which I believe all the free peoples of the world are ready, and even eager, to accept of, that you must proceed on the lines of racial affinity, of historic tradition, above all, of the actual wishes and aspirations of the inhabitants."—(*Speech of September 26, 1917, at Leeds.*)

And later he said:

"We have proclaimed, and I hope shall continue to proclaim, the right of all civilised nations, small or great, to self-determination."—(*Speech of October 16, 1918, at National Liberal Club.*)

SELF-DETERMINATION IN THE PEACE TREATIES.—It was in reliance upon such utterances that the Germans surrendered to the Allies in November, 1918. But many provisions in the Peace Treaty, which the Germans were forced to sign, are sharply opposed to the principle of self-determination.

The Saar.

A bad case is that of the district of the Saar, one of the chief German coalfields. The population (about 650,000) is entirely German, both in race and national sympathy. But by the Peace Treaty the district is in effect handed over to France.

Nominally it is administered by an International Commission; but the chairman is a Frenchman, while Germany has no representative; the district is occupied by French troops; and the coal mines, to which the district owes all its importance, are held by France in absolute and permanent ownership, in compensation for the temporary damage caused by the Germans to the mines in Northern France. At the end of 15 years the present administra-

The Speakers' Handbook

tion is to end, and the district is to decide by a plebiscite to which Government it is to belong.

Meantime, the French have many opportunities of changing the character of the population with a view to this far distant plebiscite, and they are said to be utilising their opportunities to the full.

Danzig.

Danzig is another case where the population has been denied the privilege of self-determination. This seaport of over 300,000 is almost entirely German in population, and has, except for a trifling interval, belonged to Germany for over 100 years.

There can be no doubt that the citizens of Danzig wish to be united to Germany.

By the Peace Treaty it is constituted a "Free City" under the protection of the League of Nations; but Poland has been entrusted with the control of its foreign relations, its railway system, its waterways, docks, customs, postal service, etc.

The purpose which was alleged for this arrangement was that of giving Poland free access to the sea. But the same object could have been secured by making Danzig a free port, and allowing free navigation along the River Vistula.

The existing arrangement practically unites Danzig to Poland, in violation of President Wilson's "Thirteenth Point," which lays it down that the new Polish State should be formed of undisputably Polish populations.

Upper Silesia.

In Upper Silesia a plebiscite has been taken. It was not conducted fairly, because every effort was made by the French and Polish authorities to repress the German element; and yet the voting showed a substantial German majority—62 per cent., as against 38 per cent. for Poland.

Nevertheless 49 per cent. of the population has been transferred to Poland, while Poland also obtained most of the mineral resources of the country—its mines of coal, iron, zinc, and lead.

This settlement is unjust, because all the industries of Upper Silesia have been built up by Germans, and because the country has not for many hundreds of years had any connection with Poland. The settlement has been made by a committee of the League of Nations, dominated by French influence; but it has been opposed by most of the experts, by two out of three Allied High Commissioners in Upper Silesia, and by three out of four members of the Supreme Council.

The settlement in regard to Upper Silesia inflicts the gravest injury to Germany, because it leaves her in possession of one important coalfield only, that of the Ruhr, from which large deliveries must be made to France.

Austria.

Perhaps the cruellest case is that of Austria, which has been cut off from the other provinces of the old Austrian Empire. Its industries are ruined, and it is crushed by an enormous debt.

Its only hope of salvation lies in union with Germany, and this is the earnest desire of the inhabitants. But union with Germany is expressly forbidden by the Peace Treaty.

The Tyrol.

The principle of self-determination has been violated grossly in fixing the frontier between Italy and Austria. The frontier north of the Trentino ought to have been fixed

Self Determination

where the Italian population ends and the Austrian-German begins.

Instead of this the frontier has been fixed so that 200,000 Germans are now included in Italy. There is no argument in favour of this except military convenience. This piece of country has never before belonged to Italy.

Poland.

In the newly constituted State of Poland a large non-Polish population has been included. Exact statements on the whole of this matter cannot be given, because the frontiers of Poland have not been finally fixed. But the following facts are unquestionable.

1. Nearly all West Prussia has been annexed to Poland, although two-thirds of the people are German and all the civilisation of the country has been due to Germany. No plebiscite has been allowed; if it were, it would go overwhelmingly in favour of Germany.

2. The whole of the province of Posen has been annexed to Poland, though there is a German majority in the western portion (in the presidency of Bromberg).

3. On the eastern side of Poland, the new Polish State is in possession of an enormous area and a vast population which is Russian in overwhelming majority. About ten millions of people have thus been "bartered like chattels" to Poland, who ought, according to the principle of self-determination, to belong to Russia.

THE POLICY OF LABOUR.

The policy of Labour is to rectify these unjust territorial arrangements, and to give full effect to the principle of self-determination. A means of rectification is provided by the constitution of the League of Nations. The Assembly, under Article XIX., may "reconsider any treaties which have become obsolete," and may further consider "international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." The peace of the world is endangered so long as the principle of self-determination is violated. And therefore the provisions of Article XIX. should be put into operation without delay.

Making Germany Pay

ment on that matter with what the Prime Minister said yesterday."

Thus did the Coalition and Liberal leaders take advantage of the period of abnormal relation following the armistice to cultivate and play upon the illusions of the people.

MAKING GERMANY PAY.

IN 1918.—At the last General Election six points of the Coalition's programme were issued from Downing Street. One of these was: "Make Germany Pay."

MR. LLOYD GEORGE.

The classic exposition of the theme was given at Bristol (December, 1918) by Mr. Lloyd George himself. The war had cost the Allies £24,000 millions, he said, and he continued: "Let me summarise. First, as far as justice is concerned, we have an absolute right to demand the whole cost of the war from Germany."

"The second point is that we propose to demand the whole cost of the war. (Cheers.)"

"The third point is that when you come to the exacting of it you must exact it in such a way that it does not do more harm to the country that receives it than to the country which is paying it."

"The fourth point is that the committee appointed by the British Cabinet believe that it can be done."

"The fifth point is that the Allies who are in exactly the same boat as we are, because they have also got a claim to great indemnities, are examining the proposal in conjunction with us."—("Times," December 12, 1918.)

MR. CHURCHILL.

Mr. Churchill was going to make Germany pay "to the uttermost farthing she was capable of paying—ton for ton of her shipping, her gold, her securities, and any other liquid assets of which she might dispose."

—(Dundee, December 4, 1918.)

SIR AUCKLAND GEDDES.

The Geddes followed their leader. Speaking at Plymouth on December 6, 1918, Sir Auckland Geddes said that "Germany and her allies must pay for the whole cost of the war. . . . She must pay with such gold as she had got and such raw material as we could wring out of her."

SIR ERIC GEDDES.

Sir Eric Geddes said: "Germany is going to pay restitution, reparation, and indemnity. . . . I propose that every bit of German property, movable and immovable, in allied and neutral countries, whether State property or private property of Germans, should be surrendered to the Allies, and that Germany should pay her precious citizens in her precious paper money. . . . I propose that not only all the gold Germany has got, but all the silver and jewels she has got, shall be handed over. All her pictures and libraries and everything of that kind should be sold to the neutral and allied world and the proceeds given to pay the indemnity. I would strip Germany as she has stripped Belgium."—(Cambridge, December 9, 1918.)

MR. ASQUITH TOO.

Mr. Asquith was eager to express his agreement with Mr. Lloyd George. At Nottingham he joined in the clamour for the "uttermost farthing" (Times, December 11, 1918). On the day following the Bristol declaration of Lloyd George quoted above, an elector at Pittenweem, East Fife, inquired whether he would "make the Germans pay for the war." Mr. Asquith replied that he was "in agree-

THE ALLIES' PLEDGE.—On Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the Germans laid down their arms, after having accepted "the terms of peace laid down" in President Wilson's Address to Congress of January, 1918 (the Fourteen Points), and the principles of settlement enunciated in his subsequent addresses. The Allied Governments on their part had declared their willingness to make peace on the same terms, subject only to two qualifications. The first related to the Freedom of the Seas. The second related to Reparation, and was as follows:—

"Further in the conditions of peace laid down in his Address to Congress on January 8, 1918, the President declared that invaded territories must be restored as well as evacuated and made free. The Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies, and to their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air."

—(Signed Lloyd George, Orlando, Wilson, Clemenceau, November 5, 1918.)

The German and Allied Governments had pledged themselves to conclude reparation agreements according to a just and honourable interpretation of this formula, and the "limits of its application." To break that contract, and pretend that we were free to exact from Germany the whole cost of the war was to bring to a dishonourable conclusion a battle joined ostensibly in defence of a treaty obligation. Nevertheless, this course was adopted as an electioneering expedient by one of the signatories to that engagement within a few weeks of its conclusion.

AFTER THREE YEARS.—From December, 1918, the leaders of the Coalition had to sustain the illusions which they had created, and by which they profited, at the price of the peace and economic reconstruction of Europe. Then there came to them a revelation that it would be wiser to adopt for the next election the reparations policy which they had denounced at the last General Election.

"NONSENSICAL FROTH."

Mr. Churchill, for example, discovered that Mr. Lloyd George had been speaking *nonsensical froth*.

He was delighted to see the steady, remorseless march of statesmen of all countries during the last few months towards financial sanity. Not only electioneering politicians, but grave financiers and august members of the Judiciary who had been speaking *nonsensical froth* about extracting twenty thousand millions from Germany, had reduced themselves to a much more practical statement of the case.

—(Mr. Churchill's speech at the British Overseas Banks Association—"Times," Nov. 30, 1921.)

BIRKENHEAD DISILLUSIONED.

Lord Birkenhead confessed that they had been misled by the "high financial experts," forgetting the expert Mr. Keynes, who resigned his position at the Paris Peace Conference when it became evident that hope could no longer

be entertained in the draft financial and economic sections of the Peace Treaty. With respect to the European financial position, he thought it had become clear that the payment of Reparations on anything like the scale recommended by the high financial experts was simply impossible.

—(December 16, 1921.)

This belated adoption of the Labour Party policy by the leading members of the Coalition will not protect them from a comparison of their promises with their achievements. Stated briefly, the cost of the war to Great Britain has been at least

£12,000 Millions.

We have received from Germany on balance

Nothing,

after three and a half years of intimidation, threats of extended military occupation of German territory, and the strangulation of the economic relations of Germany with the outside world.

FULFILLING THE PLEDGES.—In the Treaty of Versailles the Germans were made to declare that they were under a moral obligation to meet the cost of the war. It was recognised, however, that the resources of Germany were not adequate to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage, and they were therefore acquitted of any corresponding financial liability. (Articles 231-232.) This was the fulfilment of the Lloyd George Bristol declaration that he would "demand the whole cost of the war."

MAKING OUT THE BILL.—Having discovered that the resources of Germany would not enable them to meet the cost of the war, it was, at the same time, discovered after many debates of Allied plenipotentiaries that the claims for reparation must be made out in accordance with the Armistice terms. According to Mr. Keynes, the British delegates to the Reparations Commission of the Peace Conference supported the demand for complete war costs, and not merely reparation for damages. This claim was finally swept aside by the arguments of the American delegation.

We are told that the American delegation cabled to the President, who was then at sea, to support and maintain their position, to which he replied that the American delegation should dissent and, if necessary, dissent publicly, from a procedure which "is clearly inconsistent with what we deliberately led the enemy to expect, and cannot now honourably alter simply because we have the power."

THE TOTAL CLAIMS.—When the bills were made out the actual claims of the Allies, excluding Serbia and the United States, against Germany and her Allies made out in their respective national currencies have been estimated to work out at 225 milliard gold marks (£11,250 millions). 95 milliards (£4,750 millions) were for pensions and allowances and 130 milliards (£6,500 millions) for claims under legitimate heads. The British bill was made out for £2,557 millions. 67 per cent. of this claim was for pensions and allowances and 30 per cent. was for the loss of ships whose owners had already been reimbursed for their loss. Under the Treaty, the Reparation Commission, composed of official representatives of the Allies, had to make a more or less judicial assessment of the German liability upon the basis of these claims, and finally made their assessment at 132 milliards (£6,600 millions), to which must be added the Belgian debt to the Allies amounting to about £250 millions. That is to say, 42 per cent., or nearly one-half of the sums claimed by the Allied Governments, were not admitted by the Reparations Commission.

Even apart from the claim for pensions, this total cannot be regarded as a just measure of the damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their population. It might have been made larger, it might have been made smaller, and still have been reasonable by the standards of Versailles. It was a product of many calculations and of several important assumptions and compromises as to the valuation of loss, probable course of prices, rate of interest and foreign exchanges.

According to the agreements among the Allies made at Spa, the British share of the total indemnities—22 per cent.—made out in accordance with the Treaty was £1,540,000,000. The cost of the war to Great Britain was £12,000,000,000.

Speaking at Dundee on September 24, 1921, Mr. Churchill asked us to behold a curious, if not a pathetic, spectacle of the great nations of the world at that moment: "The great gifted nations of civilised America, England, France, Italy, all hoping to get enormous sums of money out of each other or out of Germany." In fact, said Mr. Churchill, debt collecting had become a principal industry, and took first place in the minds of many politicians and parliamentarians, and even peoples.

But who began it? The British delegation to the Peace Conference at Paris.

GERMANY PAYS.

May 1, 1921, was one of the dates in the Treaty of Versailles when German bad faith, a fundamental postulate of French diplomacy, was to be punished by appropriate measures of violence. By this date, under Article 235 of the Treaty, Germany should have paid to the Allies £1,000,000,000 in money and money's worth, from which the expenses of the Army of Occupation were to be met, and essential imports of food and raw materials paid. The balance was to be reckoned towards the liquidation of the amounts due for reparation.

Few informed persons (outside France) believed that Germany could comply with these obligations without at the same time delivering up the very tools and equipment which German labour would need to make good the devastation. But when the Germans had handed over their mercantile marine, together with railway rolling stock, coal, animals, the Saar mines and State property in the ceded territory, etc., worth, at their own valuation, more than £1,000,000,000, and the Allied Reparations Commission had given them credit for £400,000,000, subject to deductions, the majority of the French Chamber accused the German Government of wilful default, took measures to have more than a million men under arms, and sent their Prime Minister (M. Briand) to London to demand Allied support for the occupation and economic exploitation of the Ruhr as a penalty for non-fulfilment of the Treaty in this and other respects, and a guarantee against future payments in the coming two, if necessary three, generations.

Invasion of the Ruhr.

The Allies did not reject the invasion of the Ruhr, in principle. This was a French victory. They decided, however, that the Ruhr must not be invaded just then. This was a French defeat.

It was true that the Germans had not paid £1,000,000,000 by May 1, 1921. But the dispute was one as to methods of valuation, and there were certain things which the Allies themselves ought to have done by May 1, and had not yet done.

Allies Return to the Treaty.

It was only on April 27, 1921, that the Germans had been informed by the Reparation Commission of the

full extent of their obligations for damage. It had still to draw up a schedule of payments prescribing how this obligation was to be discharged.

Voluntary acquiescence by the Germans in any scheme of prospective payments acceptable to the dominant parties in France and Britain had proved impossible.

"Declaration of Resolve."

The Allies were just in time. As stated above, the Germans had been informed verbally on April 27 of the amount of their total liability for damage. On May 6, five days behind the date in the Treaty, they heard through the Reparation Commission how and when payment was demanded. At the same time the Supreme Council called upon the German Government to "declare its resolve" to carry out the obligations and accept the guarantees defined by the Reparation Commission, as well as certain measures relating to disarmament, the trial of the war criminals, and the most favoured nation treatment for Allied traders. Failing the "declaration of its resolve" in the required terms, the Allies would "proceed to the occupation of the Valley of the Ruhr, and take all other naval and military measures that may be required." Meanwhile, 200,000 French soldiers were called from their homes to reinforce the standing army, exceeding 800,000 men. But a new German Government "declared its resolve," and the French army of invasion stands at attention outside the gates of the Promised Land.

If the terms of the reparation "settlement" are to be read as Shylock read his bond, then several times each year there will be accusations of default, threats of military measures, and one day the still smouldering Great War will pass into a new phase.

The Reparation Commission having ascertained the amount of damage, had to draw up a schedule of payments prescribing the time and manner for securing and discharging the obligation.

If, in the execution of the first part of the task assigned to them by the Treaty the members of the Commission appeared to act with an authority derived from the Treaty itself, and not from their respective Governments, in the performance of the second part they were only allowed to appear at the ceremonial function.

It was a sub-committee of the Supreme Council, not the Reparation Commission, which drew up the scheme of payment.

By the financial scheme of London, May, 1921, the German Government was obliged to pay each year in quarterly instalments

- (1) A fixed sum of £100 millions; and
- (2) a varying sum equivalent to 6 per cent. of the value of her exports.

Net receipts of all kinds received by Great Britain from Germany, whether finally allotted to the British Empire or not, amounted in February, 1922, to £48,500,000, and of this sum £2,639,500 has been paid to colonial governments in settlement of part of their claim for the Army of Occupation.

The estimated cost of the British Army of Occupation up to January 31 1922, was £50,350,000. (Sir R. Horne, House of Commons, February 23, 1922.) There is, therefore, a Budget deficit of some millions on account of the British effort to make Germany pay.

The Reparation Commission estimated that the total value of deliveries and payments made by Germany from November 11, 1918, to November 30, 1921 (including

the value of State properties in ceded territories, and the value of the Saar mines) was £321,000,000 (6,420,000,000 gold marks).

The total cost of all the armies of occupation from November 11, 1918, to May 21, 1921, amounted to 3,639,382,000 gold marks (£181,966,100). The schedule of payments accepted by Germany in May, 1921, under threat of further military occupation of her territory, was abandoned by the Allies before the first year of its operation. A provisional postponement of the instalments due on January 15 and February 15, 1922, was granted and revised payments substituted. The liability of Germany in 1922 has been fixed at £36 millions in cash, and £47½ millions in kind for France, and £25 millions in kind for all the other Allies. The Reparation Commission accompanied their notice of this liability with the proposal that the German Government should immediately draw up a scheme for increasing the revenue from taxation in 1922-23 by 60,000,000 paper marks, to be passed and put in force by May 31, 1922. It is reported that the Reichstag rocked with laughter at the very idea.

A new reparation plan prepared by the British Treasury would affect another permanent and substantial diminution of the sums payable by Germany under the London ultimatum of May, 1921. The total of 132 milliards (£6,600 millions) would be reduced immediately by 25 milliards (£1,250 millions) regarded as non-German reparation, and again by 65 milliards (£3,250 millions) regarded as a contingent liability for inter-Allied debts. The amount of Germany's liability is thus made to depend upon the extent to which the United States demands payment from European Allies. Both the United States and the other Allies have still to acquiesce in this scheme, which would reduce the effective liability of Germany under the operation of the Treaty from £6,600,000,000 to £2,100,000,000.

Therefore the Coalition leaders who won the General Election upon the plea that they would make the Germans pay began by taking the lead at Paris in the making of exorbitant and illegitimate demands. Every step they have to retrace towards sanity is made more difficult by the strides which they had taken away from the councils of financial reason. They began by demanding that Germany should pay the whole cost of the war, and in less than four years afterwards are only lacking in the courage of declaring their opinion that further claims for reparation by Great Britain ought to be abandoned.

CAPACITY TO PAY.—Only experts can answer how much Germany can afford to pay and the Allies afford to take from her. Mr. Keynes, former Financial Adviser to the British Peace Delegation, is one of these.

After conscientious and expert analysis he wrote:—

"I reach, therefore, the final conclusion that, including all methods of payment—immediately transferable wealth, ceded property, and an annual tribute—£2,000,000,000 is a safe maximum figure of Germany's capacity to pay. In all the actual circumstances I do not believe that she can pay as much. Let those who consider this a very low figure bear in mind the following remarkable comparison:—The wealth of France in 1871 was estimated at a little less than half that of Germany in 1913. Apart from changes in the value of money, an indemnity from Germany of £500,000,000 would, therefore, be about comparable to the sum paid by France in 1871; and as the real burden of an indemnity increases more than in proportion to its amount, the payment of £2,000,000,000 by Germany would have far severer consequences than the £200,000,000 paid by France in 1871."

"It is for those who believe that Germany can make an annual payment amounting to hundreds of millions sterling to say in **what specific commodities** they intend this payment to be made, and in **what markets** the goods are to be sold. . . . Until they proceed to some degree of detail, and are able to produce some tangible argument in favour of their conclusion, they do not deserve to be believed."

—(Keynes: "*Economic Consequences of the Peace*," pp. 186-188.)

The British Government have produced nothing to prove that the Paris Annuities are within Germany's capacity for payment.

During the Paisley by-election Mr. Asquith declared that he had also come to the conclusion that £2,000 millions was as much as Germany could pay.

"Speaking with a full sense of responsibility, I tell you that in my judgment, after much consideration and such examination as I could give to all the relevant facts, I am disposed to believe that, after making allowance for what is needed to restart German industrial life, £2,000 millions is about the outside that can be got from Germany."

—(MR. ASQUITH, at Paisley, February 7, 1920.)

Mr. Keynes estimates that the number of houses destroyed in Northern France was 300,000. "Suppose," says Mr. Keynes, "as an outside estimate we take them as costing £1,000 each, the total amount would be £300,000,000, which is less than the interest against Germany for one year on the basis of the present demands."

. . . In addition to 300,000 houses destroyed there are about another 300,000 which were injured in greater or less degree. . . . Of that 300,000 considerably the greater part have been repaired already." The cost for the repair of the coal mines destroyed in Northern France would be about £50,000,000. There is also the question of the cultivated fields. Last year M. Briand stated in the French Senate that of the fields interfered with by warfare 95 per cent. had been relevelled and 90 per cent. were under the plough. "None of these things is, in relation to the numbers of her population and to the size of her wealth, anything which ought to be outside the capacity of Germany to make good within a reasonable time. . . ."

—(MR. J. M. KEYNES at Caxton Hall on Oct. 13, 1921.)

LABOUR POLICY.

At Frankfurt, February 27, 1922, the Labour and Socialist Parties of France, Belgium, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy reached the following resolution:—

The restoration of the devastated regions, in particular in Belgium and in France, must be assumed by Germany to the full extent of her capacity. The Trade Unions and Socialist organisations of Germany again proclaimed the necessity of these reparations at the Conferences held in Amsterdam in April, 1921, and pledged themselves to assist in carrying them out with all their energy and with all the means at their disposal.

Actual experience, however, has demonstrated the failure of the reparation system conceived at Versailles. Germany's exports have not developed sufficiently to provide her with means of payment in gold. The German exchanges have collapsed to the extent of making the purchase of foreign currency extremely difficult. The general buying capacity of the world has shrunk to such an extent that German exports, whilst insufficient to provide her with the means to make the payments that had been imposed upon her, have yet sufficed to bring

about a general unemployment crisis in the other industrial countries.

With regard to all these points, however, the weakness of the German Government in relation to the German capitalist class bears a part of the responsibility.

The problem is thus, on the one hand, to free France and Belgium from the burden which actually weighs upon them at present and, on the other hand, to enable Germany to make reparation without having to engage in operations which have a crushing effect on her exchanges and impoverishing and degrading the German working class, and increase still more the export premium which, for the most part, strikes at the wages of their workers.

The Conference also declared that the policy of recourse to force stands condemned in principle and by the facts.

The policy of international mutual aid necessary to the economic restoration of the world and the bringing into operation of the system of reconstruction by the solidarity of all our efforts, presupposes, in the first place and in any case, the immediate raising of the military penalties imposed at the time of the London ultimatum, and, immediately afterwards, the cessation of the military occupation, which may involve new occupations, injure the feelings of the people in the occupied territories, absorb the sums collected by Germany for the reparation of the devastated countries and, nourishing the spirit of hatred, risk giving rise to new conflicts.

OPINIONS ON LABOUR.

What They Say.

THE PRIME MINISTER.—... That brings me to the new factor in politics. A great new party has burst into the system and has disturbed the whole of the party gravitation. It is no use making a mistake and treating this as a temporary phenomenon. It is the result of a generation of very hard, persistent, continuous work. . . . The people of this country move slowly, and they moved very slowly towards Socialism. They will move back slowly. Do not make the mistake of treating this as if it were a sort of a plague or pestilence that will pass away when the weather improves. It has come to stay. . . . Have you taken the trouble to look at their programme? You hear them in the House of Commons talking about high prices and putting questions about the conditions of labour here and there. That is not what they are talking about in the constituencies. The men who are here are not the exponents of the real movement. . . . This is what they conceive to be the attractive part of their programme :—

The chief objects of the Labour Party are to secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruit of their industry and the most equitable distribution wherever that may be possible upon the basis of common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration, and control in each industry or service.

It is common ownership. In France it was known as Communism; and in Russia it is known as Bolshevism. . . . They are beginning by demanding nationalisation of this industry and of the other industry. They are going on. It is not an ideal, it is a working programme. The redress of grievances and the improvement of conditions, as you will see in the Communist literature, are regarded as treason to the cause. Why? Because it strengthens the system they want to condemn. They are out for destroying this system root and branch, and planting another tree with a different fruit. . . .—(To the Liberal Parliamentary Party at the House of Commons on March 18, 1920.)

PRIME MINISTER AGAIN.—They (the Labour Party) are a great formidable, menacing party, a party which will become the dominating party, unless we take the necessary steps to inform the electorate what are the issues they are raising. They are issues of such magnitude; they are issues which are so threatening to the whole fabric of society, that it is folly to quarrel about trivialities when you are confronted with issues of that character. I read the other day a newspaper which is subsidised by this party, and which is supposed more or less to be its official exponent in the Press. This is what they say: "No reform, no mere nominal preservation or even advance of money wages in a particular industry or locality will ultimately affect the issue. Capitalism means the beating down of the poor into further poverty, and Labour will have to submit to this unless it goes out to overthrow Capitalism." What does this mean translated into action, translated into other formulas which I can quote on official authority of that party? It means the destruction of private property, the destruction of private enterprise, conversion of the whole means of production into a great State machine. That may be good; that may be bad—it may be very bad. But make no mistake, it

is a complete revolution in that old system upon which this country has been built up, and upon which the prosperity of every other land has been built. . . .

The Labour Party is something definite. There is no mistake about what they mean. There is no vagueness there. Therefore the nation can judge. Vagueness misleads. It enables those wild programmes to make headway. You cannot resist bullets by a bank of fog. In every country you have revolutionaries and you have reactionaries, but they are a small minority, both of them. . . .—(At the 1920 Club, December 17, 1921.)

LORD MILNER.—"How would you regard the advent of a Labour Government? Would you be fearful of it?"

Lord Milner replied: "I should not be apprehensive of a Labour Government, though I think it might often try to do the right things in a wrong way. And as regards Imperial and foreign affairs, it would certainly have a great deal to learn. On the other hand, I do not think its domestic programme would be very alarming. Of course, I am assuming that the extreme elements, who are simply wreckers, would not get the upper hand."

"How do you regard the policy of nationalisation?"

"The word has many different senses. If it means the bureaucratic control of industry, I am dead against it. If, on the other hand, it means that the great staple industries should be publicly owned—by corporations of workers—then I think it is a sound ideal, though it can only be reached gradually. It is quite certain that our present industrial system is only a transient form of organisation. It is bound to undergo a radical change, though the change may be, and indeed ought to be, gradual."

"How do you imagine that change?"

"To put it in a sentence—I should say that the true line of advance is towards a state of things in which instead of Capital hiring Labour, Labour will hire Capital."

—From an interview in *Outward Bound*, August, 1921.

THE BUDGET, 1922-1923.

ESTIMATED REVENUE, 1922-23.		Actual Revenue, 1921-22.
	£	£
Customs	112,250,000	130,052,000
Excise	160,750,000	194,291,000
<i>Total Customs and Excise</i>	<i>273,000,000</i>	<i>324,343,000</i>
Motor Vehicle Duties	10,600,000	11,096,000
Estate, &c., Duties	48,000,000	52,191,000
Stamps	18,250,000	19,638,000
Land Tax, House Duty, and Mineral Rights Duty	3,000,000	2,590,000
Income Tax (including Super- Tax)	329,000,000	398,887,000
Excess Profits Duty, &c.	27,800,000	30,452,000
Corporation Profits Tax	19,750,000	17,516,000
<i>Total Inland Revenue</i> ...	<i>445,800,000</i>	<i>521,274,000</i>
TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM TAXES	<i>£729,400,000</i>	<i>856,713,000</i>
Postal Service	35,667,000	40,000,000
Telegraph Service	5,230,000	5,900,000
Telephone Service	13,728,000	10,500,000
<i>Total Post Office</i>	<i>54,625,000</i>	<i>56,400,000</i>
Crown Lands	750,000	820,000
Interest on Sundry Loans ...	14,000,000	13,807,000
Miscellaneous :— Ordinary Receipts	22,000,000	26,334,000
Special Receipts	90,000,000	170,806,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS FROM NON-TAX REVENUE	<i>£181,375,000</i>	<i>268,167,000</i>
<i>TOTAL REVENUE</i> ...	<i>£910,775,000</i>	<i>1,124,880,000</i>

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE, 1922-23.		Actual Expenditure 1921-22.
	£	£
<i>War Services.</i>		
Army	55,300,000	95,110,000
Navy	64,434,000	80,770,000
Air Force	9,936,000	13,560,000
National Debt Services	335,000,000	332,294,000
Special Expen- diture ¹	61,223,000	
	525,893,000	521,734,000
<i>Peace Services.</i>		
Civil Services ²	264,641,000	449,700,000
Customs and Ex- cise, and In- land Revenue Departments..	12,275,000	14,190,000
Post Office Ser- vices	53,822,000	65,977,000
Payments for Northern Ire- land Residuary Share, etc. ..	2,500,000	1,104,000
Road Fund ...	10,000,000	10,795,000
Payments to Local Taxa- tion Accounts	9,788,000	11,172,000
Land Settle- ment	3,500,000	2,647,000
Other Consoli- dated Fund Services	2,650,000	1,868,000
	359,176,000	557,453,000
Provision for Supplementary Estimates	25,000,000	
Surplus	706,000	
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>910,775,000</i>	<i>1,079,187,000</i>

¹ For "services arising out of war" of a transitory nature, including resettlement and reconstruction and "liquidation of war commitments."
² Includes for the Ministry of Pensions, £280,001,000 in 1922-23 and £111,656,606 in 1921-22. This is clearly a "war" expenditure; and unemployment grant ought also to be reckoned as due to "war."

CHANGES IN TAXATION.

FOOD TAXES.—The following reductions are proposed in the Budget for 1922-23:—

	Existing Duties.		Proposed Duties.	
	Full Rate.	Preferential Rate.	Full Rate.	Preferential Rate.
CUSTOMS:—	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Tea - - - - - the lb.	0 1 0		0 0 8	
Cocoa - - - - - the cwt.	2 2 0		1 8 0	
Husks and Shells - - - the cwt.	0 6 0		0 4 0	
Butter - - - - - the lb.	0 0 4½		0 0 3	
Coffee:—				
Not kiln-dried, roasted or ground the cwt.	2 2 0	Five-sixths of Full Rate.	1 8 0	Five-sixths of Full Rate.
Kiln-dried, roasted or ground - - - the lb.	0 0 6		0 0 4	
Coffee and Chicory:—				
Roasted and ground, mixed - - - the lb.	0 0 6		0 0 4	
Chicory:—				
Raw or kiln-dried - the cwt.	1 19 8		1 6 6	
Roasted or ground - the lb.	0 0 6		0 0 4	
EXCISE:—				
Chicory:—				
Raw or kiln-dried - the cwt.	Five-sixths of 1 18 6		1 1	
Coffee or Chicory substitutes or any mixture of such substitutes with Coffee or Chicory - - - the ½ lb.	0 0 1½		0 0 1	
Sugar: varying - - - the cwt.	Five-sixths of 11s. 2d. to £1 3s. 4d.			
(According to polarization).				
Molasses: varying - the cwt.	Five-sixths of 4s. 9½d. to 13s. 6d.			Excise duty repealed.

INCOME TAX.—The changes are (a) in the standard rate from 6s. to 5s. in the £. These are dealt with above (p. 12). (b) Agriculture: persons occupying land for husbandry and assessed under Schedule B on the basis of *twice* the annual value of the land occupied will now be assessed on the *single* annual value. Persons occupying land for pleasure, etc., now assessed under Schedule B on basis of single annual value of the land, will now be assessed at only *one-third* of the annual value.

The following rates of duty are continued for 1922-23:—

Sugar	2½d. in the lb.
Currants	2s. in the cwt.
Other dried fruit	10s. 6d. in the cwt.
Tobacco ... about 9s. 1d. in the lb. (over 6d in the oz.)	
Beer	1s. 0½d. in 3 pints

NOTE: Beer duty is £5 per "standard" barrel of 1055° gravity; but beer at 5d. a pint is from 1030° to 1032° gravity, and beer at 6d. a pint is about 1037° gravity. Therefore, of course, the cheaper beers do not pay £5 per actual barrel. The duty paid on 5d. a pint beer is about £2 15s. per actual barrel.

Before the war ¾d. on a 2d. pint of beer went to the Government, if the beer was of 1042.58° gravity. Now, for the *same kind of beer*, the price is 7d. a pint, of which 3d. goes to the Government: but the sellers of the beer got ¼d. in 1914 and now get 4d. on the pint of the *same quality*.

ESTIMATED LOSS to Revenue under new proposals:—

	Estimated Loss in 1922-23.	Estimated Loss in a Full Year.
Customs:—	£	£
Tea	4,400,000	4,800,000
Cocoa	440,000	480,000
Coffee	140,000	155,000
Chicory	20,000	22,000
Total Customs*	5,000,000	5,457,000
Inland Revenue:—		
Income Tax reduced by 1s....	32,500,000	52,000,000
Other Changes in Income Tax and Super Tax	700,000	1,700,000
Excess Profits Duty	2,000,000	
Total Inland Revenue ...	35,200,000	53,700,000
Post Office:—		
Postal Revenue	4,850,000	5,550,000
Telephone Revenue	800,000	1,000,000
Total Post Office	5,650,000†	6,550,000†
Total Estimated Loss	45,850,000	65,707,000

‡ The Excise loss is insignificant.

* The total loss is estimated to amount to £3,000,000, of which £2,000,000 will affect 1922-23 and the balance subsequent years.

† These reductions, together with the proposed cost of restoring Sunday Collections, represent the surrender out of the Post Office Surplus on the Commercial Account basis of about £7,400,000 for a full year and about £6,250,000 in 1922-23.

CHANGES IN EXPENDITURE.

The Debt.—It is proposed to pay off *none* of the debt this year. Sir R. Horne (Debate, May 1, 1922) said: "At the end of the year the debt *will not be decreased*." This is a deliberate policy of reaction, following the lead of insolvent foreign Governments. It means that the greatest burden of the taxpayer is not to be lightened this year. By means of not paying off debt, the Coalition can pretend that it is economising.

Supplementary Estimates.—The allowance for 1922-23 is only £25,000,000; although the Supplementaries for 1921-22 amounted to £120,793,000 and the provision has been £97,000,000.

INDEX

	PAGE
ACCIDENTS—Mines	45
Workmen's Compensation	68
ADDISON, DR.—Woman Suffrage	122
ADULT SUFFRAGE—Labour Party—Resolution	122
ADVERTISING—Press	119
AERONAUTICS—Washington Conference	32
AFRICA, EAST—Mandate—Forced Labour	143
AFRICA, WEST—Mandate—Palm Kernels Trade	143
AGRICULTURE—	
Agriculture and the Countryside	88
Agricultural Wages Boards	80
Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1, 88
Government Promises	88
Labour Party—Policy	90
Land—	
Development	83
Inquiry Committee—Recommendations	86
Taxation	16
Lee, Lord	88
Lloyd George	89
Lloyd George—Minimum Wage	88
Minimum Wage	88
Wages—	
Agricultural Wages Board	80
Minimum Wage	88
Reductions	91
AIRCRAFT—Washington Disarmament Conference	32
AIR FORCE—Finance—Expenditure—Peace	27
ALCOHOL	111
ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION, INDUSTRIAL—	
Industrial Courts Act, 1919	74
ARCHANGEL	137
ARMAMENTS—	
Air Force Services—Expenditure	26
Army Services—Expenditure	26
Expenditure of the State	25
Finance	30
Labour Party—Policy	31
Limitation	26
Navy Services—Expenditure	25
Peace Services—Expenditure	25
War—	
Debts	25
Incidentals	26
"Where your money goes"	29
ARMIES—	
Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
Egypt	134
Finance—Expenditure—Peace	27
Germany—Occupation	152
Ireland—	
Casualties, 1920	126
Crown Forces—Casualties	126
I.R.A.—Casualties	126
R.I.C.—Outrages	152
Occupation—Germany—Cost—British	153
Occupation—Germany—Cost—British—Total	148, 154
ASQUITH, H. H.—Reparations	145
Self-determination—Speech	123
ASTOR, MAJOR—Woman Suffrage	146
AUSTRIA—Self-determination	32
AVIATION—Washington Disarmament Conference	32
BANKERS' MANIFESTO—Safeguarding of Industries Bill	34
BEER—Brewers' Bill	112
Capital	112
Labour Party—Policy	111
Parliament—Members in Business	111
Profits	112
Shares—Price	23
Taxation	6, 161
Taxation—Duty—Revenue	149
BIRKENHEAD, LORD—Reparations	123
Woman Suffrage	123

Index

	PAGE
"BIRMINGHAM DISPATCH"	119
BONDS—"Bondholders grow richer"	23
BREWERS' BILL	112
BREWING	111
BRICKLAYERS—Ex-Servicé Problems	84
BRIGHT, JOHN—Trade Unions	76
BRUCE, LORD—House of Lords Reform—Scheme	115
BUDGET, 1922-23	158
BUILDING MATERIALS—Shearing, A. G.—Statement	97
Trusts—A Builder's Evidence	97
BUILDING TRADE—Dilution—Guarantees	85
Ex-Servicemen—Unemployed	84
National Housing Schemes—	84
Distribution of Workers	98
Trusts	96
Trade Unions and Ex-Servicemen	84
BUSINESS—Bankers' Manifesto on Safeguarding of Industries Bill	34
BY-ELECTIONS, 1919-1921—Votes—House of Commons	117
CAPITAL—Distribution of Incomes	9
Income and Taxation	8
CAPITAL AND LABOUR—Lloyd George Promise, 1918	2
CAPITAL LEVY—	
Economists and Capital Levy	24
Exemption Limit	24
Foreign Countries	24
Labour Party—Policy	23
Payment in Securities	24
CARPENTERS—Ex-Servicemen—Unemployed	84
Trade Unions and Ex-Servicemen	84
CASTINGS—Trusts and Combines	39
CATERING TRADE—Trade Board	63
Wages	63
CEMENT—Trusts and Combines	39
CHILDREN—Abnormal—Statistics	106
Employment—Washington Convention	64
Health	105
Infant Mortality	106
Milk Grants	106
Pensions	108
School—Medical Examination—Statistics, 1920	105
CHINA—Washington Disarmament Conference	33
CHIROL, VALENTINE—Egypt	134
CHURCHILL, WINSTON—Egypt	134
Indemnities	4
Ireland—Two Voices	123
Railway Nationalisation	41
Reparations	4, 148, 149
Trade Unions	76, 78
COAL—Bonar Law	48
Consumers Fleeced	47
Government's Broken Promises	48
Importance of	45
Mines Nationalisation	45
Sankey Report	47
COALITION—Agriculture—Manifesto, 1918	1, 88
Armed Forces—Manifesto, 1918	1
Education—Promises	99
Egypt—Atrocities	134
Policy	131
Employment—Manifesto, 1918	1
Ex-Servicemen—Land Settlement	87
Fiscal Policy—Manifesto, 1918	1
Fiscal System—Lloyd George	95
Housing—Manifesto, 1918	1, 92
Indemnities—Churchill	4
Ireland—Policy Failure	125
Labour Policy Adopted	1
Land—Manifesto, 1918	1, 87
McKenna Duties—Broken Pledge	1, 85
Manifesto Promise, 1918	1, 87
Maternity and Child Welfare "Economies"	106
Members—Business Interests	117
Promises—"What did they say?"	1
Railway Nationalisation Promises	41
Reparations—Churchill	4
Policy	149
Russia—Policy	135
Safeguarding of Industries Act—Mond's Two Statements..	35

Index

	PAGE
Soldiers and Sailors—Manifesto, 1918	1
Unemployment	51, 55
What did they say?	1
Woman Suffrage—Opposition	122
COCOA—Taxation—Duty; Revenue	6
COFFEE—Taxation—Duty; Revenue	6
COLONIES—Mandates	142
COMBINES, Trusts and	36
COMMERCE—Fiscal System—Lloyd George	35
Manufactures—Exports	34
Policy	34
Business Men's Protests	34
Coalition Statements	35
Dye Stuffs Act	35
Trade Slump	34
Trade—Exports 1920, 1921 (Value)	34
Imports 1920, 1921 (Value)	34
Statistics	34
COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS—Statistics, 1920, 1921 (Value)	34
Manufactures	34
CORPORATION TAX	24
COTTON—Lock-out, 1921	74
Sewing—Company Profits	37
Trusts and Combines	37
CRIME AND EDUCATION	163
CROWN FORCES—Ireland	126
CUT NAILS—Trusts and Combines	40
"DAILY EXPRESS"	119
"DAILY HERALD"	119
"DAILY MAIL"	119, 120
"DAILY MIRROR"	119, 120
"DAILY NEWS"	119
"DAILY SKETCH"	119, 120
DANZIG—Self-Determination	146
DEATH DUTIES	8
DEBT NATIONAL—Amount, 1921	23
Bondholders Grow Richer	23
Capital Levy	24
Contribution of the Rich	24
Labour Party—Policy	23
Rapid Repayment of Debt	5
Statistics	23
Taxes—Indirect	23
Beer	23
Sugar	23
Tea	23
Tobacco	25
War	138
DENIKIN, General	128
DEVLIN, JOSEPH—Labour Party tribute to	85
DILUTION—Building—Guarantees	32
DISARMAMENT—Conference—Aircraft	33
China	31
Conference, Washington	32
Pacific Pact	32
Poison Gas	31
Ships	32
Submarines	32
Washington Conference	31
DRINK TRAFFIC—Beer—Profits	111
Brewers' Bill	112
Capital	112
Labour Party—Policy	111
Parliament—Members in Business	111
Profits	112
Shares—Price	6, 11
Taxation	111
"Trade" Influence	111
DYES AND DYING—	35
Dye-Stuffs Act—Letter on Working	
"EDINBURGH EVENING NEWS"	119
EDUCATION—Coalition Promises	99
Continuation	103
Crime and	101
Estimates, 1918, 1922	99, 100
Expenditure	

Index

	PAGE
Finance—Comparison with Armed Forces	100
Cost per Child	101
"Cuts"	102
Expenditure, 1913, 1921	100
Estimates—Statistics	101
Revenue	101
Teachers' Pensions	102
Teachers' Salaries	102
True and False Economy	103
Fisher, H.A.L.—Denial	99
Labour Party—Policy	104
Publications	104
Resolution, 1921	104
Lloyd George—Statements	99
Prime Minister	99
Publications—Labour Party	104
Revenue	101
Robbing the Children	100
Schemes in Abeyance	100
Taxation	101
Teachers—Pensions	102
Salaries	102
Unemployment—Coalition Action	50
Value	103
Egypt—Army	134
Atrocities	134
Before the War	131
Chirol, Valentine	134
Churchill, Winston	134
Coalition—Atrocities	134
Labour Party—Policy	131
Resolution	133
Milner Mission	132
Pledges	131
Policy of Conciliation—Lord Allenby	131
Policy of Contempt	131
Policy of Violence—Zaghlul Pasha	131
Trades Union Congress—Resolution	132
EIGHT-HOUR DAY—Labour Party—Policy	60
Washington Convention	64
ELECTIONS-BY, 1919-1921—Votes—House of Commons	117
ELECTORAL REFORM—Labour Party Resolution	122
ELECTRIC LAMPS—Profiteering	37
Trusts and Combines	37
EMIGRATION—Unemployment—Lloyd George	59
EMPLOYMENT—Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES—Washington Convention	64
ENGINEERING TRADE—Ex-Servicemen—Unemployed	83
Trade Unions and Ex-Servicemen	83
ENTERTAINMENTS—Taxation	0, 12, 24
"EVENING EXPRESS"	119
"EVENING NEWS"	119, 120
EVENING NEWSPAPERS	119
"EVENING STANDARD"	119
EXPENDITURE, NATIONAL—Education	100
Statistics	5
EXPLOSIVES—Trusts and Combines	33
EXPORTS—1920, 1921 (Value)	34
Ships Tonnage—Statistics	65
EX-SERVICEMEN—Apprenticeships	86
Bricklayers—Unemployed	84
Building Trade—Unemployed	84
Carpenters' Case	84
Demobilisation Problems	83
Dilution—Guarantee	85
Engineering Trade—Unemployed	85
Housing—Government's Failure	85
Land Settlement	87
Re-employment—Statistics, 1921	83
Statistics—Training	86
Trade Unions	83
Training Schemes	86
Training—Statistics	86
Unemployed	83
FARES—Railway	42
FINANCE, NATIONAL—	
Armaments	29
Budget, 1922-23	158
Debt	5
Education	101
Expenditure	5, 100

Index

	PAGE
Income, National	5, 6
Labour Party—Policy	10
National Debt	23
Revenue	5
Death Duties	8
Entertainment Tax	6
Income Tax	7
Indirect Taxes	6
Taxes, Indirect	23
Wealth—Analysis, 1914	8
FINANCE—TRADE UNION	60
"FINANCIAL TIMES"	120
FISCAL POLICY—Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
Coalition Statement—Lloyd George	35
FISHER, H. A. L.—Education—Coalition Promise Denial	90
Woman Suffrage	123
FOOD—Supply—Statistics, 1920, 1921	34
Taxation	6, 11, 24
FORTY-FOUR HOUR WEEK—Labour Party—Bill	86
Labour Party—Policy	66
FOUNDRY WORK—Castings—Trusts	39
FRANCHISE—Women's Emancipation Bill	122
FREE TRADE—Fiscal System—Lloyd George Statement	35
Manifesto—Bankers	74
FREIGHT RATES—Railway	43
FRIENDLY SOCIETIES—Registrar and Trade Unions	82
GAS, POISON—Washington Disarmament Conference	32
GEDDES, AUCKLAND—Repairs	148
GEDDES, SIR ERIC—Railway Nationalisation	42
Repairs	148
GENERAL ELECTION, 1918—VOTES—House of Commons	117
GEORGE V.—Housing	92
GERMANY—	
Army of Occupation—Cost—British	159
Total	153
Repairs	2, 148
"GLASGOW EVENING TIMES"	119
"GLASGOW RECORD"	120
"GLOBE"	120
GREGORY, HOLMAN—Workmen's Compensation	67
HEALTH, PUBLIC—See Public Health.	
HENDERSON, ARTHUR, M.P.—Old-Age Pensions—Motion	110
HORNE, ROBERT, SIR—	
Ex-Service Men—Apprenticeships	80
High Taxes One Cause of Unemployment	28
Training Schemes	55
HOURS—Eight-Hour Day—Labour Policy	60
Forty-four Hour Week—Labour Policy	66
Labour Party—Policy	66
Labour Party—Resolution	67
Unemployment—Coalition Action	57
Washington Convention	64
HOUSE OF COMMONS—Business Groups	118
Members—Business Interests	117
Votes	117
By-Elections, 1919-1921	117
General Election, 1918	117
Parties—Statistics	117
Votes—Parties' Statistics	117
HOUSE OF LORDS—Business Groups—	
Brewing	114
Commercial	113
Directors—Statistics	114
Landowners	114
Mining	114
Press	114
Railway	114
Shipping	116
Labour Party—Resolution	113
Members—Business Interests	113
Statistics	116
Reform—Bryce Scheme	116
Labour Party—Resolution	116
Tory Scheme—Official	115
Second Chamber—Labour Party—Resolution	115

Index

	PAGE
HOUSING—Birmingham	95
Building Trade—Builder's Evidence	97
Distribution of Workers	98
Trusts	99
Coalition Manifesto	1, 92
England—Need of Houses	54
Ex-Service Men	85
George V. King	92
"Government to Blame"	96
Government's Failure	95
Health and Housing	94
Birmingham	95
Statistics	95
Tuberculosis	94
Inchcape, Lord	96
King George V	92
Labour—Building Trade—Labour Party—Policy	93
Land—Rating	20
Lloyd George	92, 95
Long, Walter	92
Maternity and Child Welfare	107
National Housing and Town Planning—Memo.	96
Need for Houses	93
Overcrowding	95
Policy—Labour Party	93
Prime Minister	92, 95
Promises and Performance	92
Scotland—Need of Houses	96
"Secretary for	96
Summary of Facts	93
Unemployment—Coalition Action	96
Wales—Need of Houses	94
"HULL DAILY MAIL"	119
Imports, 1920, 1921 (value)	34
INCHEAPE, LORD—Housing	90
INCOME, NATIONAL	5, 6
INCOME TAX—Allowances	7
Budget, 1922-23	155
Labour Party—Policy	12
Revenue, 1921	24
Statistics	7, 8, 9
Wealth—Analysis 1914	8
INDEMNITIES—British Share	151
Churchill	4
Labour Party, on	4
INDIA—Labour Party—Policy	129
Reforms Imperilled	120
INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE, 1919—	
Trade Union Recommendations—Extracts	3
INDUSTRIAL COURTS ACT, 1919	74
Government Refuse Inquiry	75
INDUSTRIES—Safeguarding of Industries Bill	34
Business Men's Protests	28
Dye Stuffs Act—Working	35
INFANT MORTALITY—Australia, 1919	105
Bad Housing	94
Statistics	103
INSURANCE—Workmen's Compensation—Companies	68
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR—Washington Conventions	64
IRELAND—	
Army—Crown Forces—Casualties	126
I.R.A.—Casualties	126
R.I.C.—Outrages	126
Casualties, 1920	126
Churchill's Two Voices	128
Civilians—Casualties, 1920	126
Coalition Policy—Failure	125
Commission of Inquiry	127
Cost of Damage	126
Crown Forces—Casualties	126
Devlin's Tribute to Labour	128
"Dispersing the Terrorists"—Lloyd George—Speech	125
Finance—Cost of Damage	126
Government Statements	125
Labour Party—Commission of Inquiry	127
Labour Policy	126
Lloyd George—Reply to Bishops	125
Lloyd George—Two Voices	127
Newspaper Statements—Outrages	126
Outrages 1920	126
Peace, Offer of	128
Police, Casualties, 1920	126
Premier's Two Voices	127
Republican Army—Casualties	126
R.I.C.—Outrages	126
Soldiers—Casualties, 1920	126
Irish Republican Army—Casualties, 1920-21	126

Index

PAGE

JUVENILE EMPLOYMENT—Unemployment—Labour Party Proposals	54
KAISER—Prosecution—Lloyd George Promise, 1918	2
KEYNES, J. M.—Reparations	153
KOLTCHAK, ADMIRAL—Russia—Failure	138
LABOUR AND CAPITAL—Lloyd George Promise, 1918	2
LABOUR AND SOCIALIST PARTIES—	
Reparations—Resolution, Frankfurt, 1922	154
LABOUR AND THE RATES	13
LABOUR EXCHANGES—Washington Convention	64
LABOUR, FORCED—Africa, East—Mandate	143
LABOUR—	
International—Washington Conventions	64
LABOUR, MINISTRY OF—Trade Boards—Policy Failure	62
LABOUR PARTY—Agriculture—Policy	90
Armaments—Policy	30
Bills—Forty-four Hour Week	66
Women's Emancipation	108
Women's Pensions	24
Capital Levy—Policy	4
Coalition Adopts Labour Party	144
Colonial Policy—Mandates	112
Drink Traffic—Resolution	132-133
Education	10
Egypt	10
Finance	116
House of Lords—Reform	93
Housing	4
Income Tax	129
Indemnities	126-7
India	16, 21
Ireland	156
Land Taxation	144
Lloyd George—Speech	3
Mandates	107
Manifesto, 1918—Extracts	157
Maternity and Child Welfare	108
Milner, Lord	24
Mothers' Pensions	110
National Debt	156
Old Age Pensions	108
Opinions on	121
Pensions—Women and Children	156
Press Policy	4
Prime Minister—Speech	139
Railway Nationalisation	116
Russia	147
Second Chamber	10
Self-Determination	63
Taxation	50-54
Trade Boards	66
Unemployment	122
Washington Conventions	108
Women's Emancipation Bill	68
Women's Pensions	73
Workmen's Compensation	67
LABOUR UNREST—Causes	88
LABOUR, UNSKILLED—Unemployment	1, 87
LAND—Agriculture and the Countryside	85
Coalition Manifesto, 1918	87
Development	20
Ex-Service Men	88
Housing—Rating	16
Inquiry Committee—Recommendations	19
Labour Party—Taxation	13
Lloyd George—Rating	20
Taxation	21
Rating—Housing—Landlord's Exactions	19
Labour Party	21
Lloyd George	21
Returns—Scotland	22
Statistics	143
Valuation	16
Rhodesia—Robbery by Mandate	18
Taxation—Labour Party Policy	19
Lloyd George—Speeches	16
Rating of Values	48
Valuation	35
LAW, BONAR—Mines Nationalisation	88
On McKenna Duties	120
LEE, LORD—Agriculture	36
"LEEDS MERCURY"	41
LEVER COMBINE	
LIBERALS, INDEPENDENT—Railway Nationalisation	

Index

LIGHT CASTINGS—Trusts and Combines	PAGE
Liquor Traffic—Beer—Profits	39
Brewers' Bill	111
Capital	112
Labour Party—Policy	112
Parliament—Members in Business	112
Profits	111
Shares—Price	111
"Trade"—Influence	112
LLOYD GEORGE, DAVID—Agriculture	111
Agriculture—Minimum Wage	89
Capital and Labour	88
Coal Mines—Nationalisation	2
Debt of Honour	2
Economic Europe—Cannes, 1921	48
Education	4
Emigration—Unemployment	99
Fiscal System	69
Germany Must Pay	35
Housing	2
Ireland	92, 95
Kaiser	125, 127
Labour and Capital	2
Labour Party—Speech	2
Land—Rating; Taxation	158
Mandates	18, 19
Production	142
Promises, 1918	2
Railway Nationalisation	2
Reparations	41
Russia	2, 148, 149
Self-Determination	156
Unemployment—Promises	145
LOCK-OUTS—Cotton, 1921	61
Miners, 1921	74
LONDON LABOUR PARTY—Unemployment—Proposals	74
LONDON LABOUR PARTY—Unemployment—Proposals	64
LONG, WALTER—Housing	92
McKENNA DUTIES	35
"MANCHESTER EVENING CHRONICLE"	119
MANDATES—Africa, East—Forced Labour	143
Africa, West—Palm Kernels Trade	143
British Dependencies	143
East Africa—Forced Labour	143
Rhodesia—Land Robbery	143
West Africa—Palm Kernels Trade	143
Labour Party—Policy	144
LLOYD GEORGE—Speeches	142
Mesopotamia	140
Performance	142
Promises—Lloyd George	142
Rhodesia—Land Robbery	143
MANUFACTURES—Statistics (Value), 1920-1921	143
MATERNAL MORTALITY—Statistics	34
MATERNITY AND CHILD WELFARE—Avoidable Suffering	105
Benefits	105
Children—Abnormal	65
Health	105
Mortality	105
Convention—Labour's Policy	107
Government "Economist"	106
Housing	107
Infantile Mortality	105
Labour Party—Policy	60, 107
Maternal Mortality	105
Meals for Mothers	106
Milk Grants	106
Washington Convention	66, 66
MATERNITY—Benefits	65
MATERNITY CONVENTION—Labour's Policy	107
MEALS for Mothers	106
MESOPOTAMIA—Administration—People not Consulted	140
Choosing a King	140
Expenditure—Administration	140
International Complication	141
Mandate	140
"Oil in Mosul"	140
MILK—Grants to Mothers and Children	106
MILNER, LORD—Egypt—Mission	182
Labour Party	167
MINERS—Accidents	45
Bill	49
Health and Safety	45
Lock-out, 1921	74
Press Attacks on	21
Wages	45, 46, 67

Index

MINES—Accidents	PAGE
Government's Broken Promises	46
Nationalisation	46
Advantages	46
Owners' Profits	47
Profits	47
Sankey Report	47
Bonar Law	48
Lloyd George	48
MINIMUM WAGE—Agriculture	88
MINISTRY OF LABOUR—Trade Boards—Policy Failure	62
MOND, SIR ALFRED—	
Safeguarding of Industries' Act—Two Statements	35
MORRIS, WILLIAM—Trade Unions	76
MOTHERS—Maternal Mortality	105
Meals	106
Milk Grants	106
Mothers' Pensions	108
MOTOR FUEL—Trusts and Combines	38
MURMANSE—Russia	137
NAILS—Trusts and Combines	40
NATIONAL DEBT—Amount, 1921	23
Bondholders Grow Richer	23
Capital Levy	24
Contribution of the Rich	24
Labour Party—Policy	23
Rapid Repayment of Debt	23
Taxes—Indirect	23
Beer	23
Sugar	23
Tea	23
Tobacco	23
NATIONAL EXPENDITURE—Education	100
NATIONALISATION—Coal Mines	45
Railways	41
NAVY—Armaments—Limitation	31
Finance—Expenditure—Peace	27
"NEWS OF THE WORLD"	119
NEWSPAPERS	119
NOEL COMBINE	38
"NORTHERN DAILY TELEGRAPH"	119
"OBSERVER"	119
OIL—Mesopotamia	140
Motor Fuel—Trusts	38
OLD-AGE PENSIONS	109
OUT-OF-WORK PAY—Statistics	69
OUT-RELIEF—Unemployment	58
PACIFIC—Washington Conference	32
"PALL MALL GAZETTE"	120
PALM KERNELS—Trade smashed by Mandate in West Africa	143
PARLIAMENT—Business Groups	113, 118
House of Commons	113
House of Lords	113
Members—Business Interest—Drink Traffic	111
PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—Women	122
PEACE—Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
Services—Expenditure	28
Treaty—Self-Determination	145
PENSIONS—Children	108
Mothers	108
Old Age	108
Women	108
PETROLEUM—Motor Fuel—Trusts	38
PIPES—Trusts and Combines	39
POISON GAS—Washington Disarmament Conference	32
POLAND—Attack against Russia, 1920	138
Self-Determination	147
POLICE—Ireland—Casualties	126
POOR LAW—Relief—Unemployment	68
POWER OF THE PRESS	119

Index

	PAGE
PRESS—Advertising—Prices per Page	119
Anti-Labour Propaganda	120
Circulation	119
Evening Papers	119
Labour Press Policy	121
Local Weeklies	119
London Morning Papers	119
Miners—Attacks on	121
Morning Papers—London	119
Ownership	119
Power of the Press	119
Propaganda	120
Proprietors	120
Provincial Evening Papers—Sales—Net	119
Sunday Newspapers	119
PRINKIPO PROPOSAL—Russia	138
PRODUCTION, Increased—Lloyd George Promise, 1918	2
PROFITING—Committee Reports	36
Electric Lamps	37
Trusts and Combines	38
PROFITS—Beer	111
Coal Owners	47
Employers	72
Wages and Profits	69
PUBLIC HEALTH—Children	105
Housing	94
Maternity and Child Welfare	105
PUBLICITY	119
RAILWAYS—Accidents—Greater Safety	43
Bill, 1919	42
Company System Failure	41
Fares—Comparison	42
Foreign Countries—State Railways	42
Freight Rates	42
Grouping System	42
Nationalisation	41
Advantages	42
Churchill, Mr.	41
Coalition Promises	41
Company System Failure	41
Criticism—Public	43
Economy	42
Geddes—Speech	42
Government Policy	41
Government Promises	41
Independent Liberals	41
Labour Party—Policy	41
Lloyd George—Reply	41
Policy	41
Runciman, Mr.	41
Rates on Goods	43
Rolling Stock—Wagons	41
Safety of Life	43
Saving Present Waste	43
State—Foreign Countries	42
Strike, 1919	73
Trusts	41
Wagon Scandal	41
Waste—Saving Present	43
RAILWAY CLERKS' ASSOCIATION—Finance	82
RATES—Assessable Value	14
Increase, Recent	14
Labour and the Rates	13
Land	10, 21, 22
Local Authorities—Expenditure	14
London	15
Ministry of Health Report	13
Provinces	15
Railway—Goods	14
Statistics	14
Unemployment	58
RAW MATERIALS—Statistics (Value), 1920-1921	34
REES, J. D., Sir—Woman Suffrage	123
REPARATIONS—Germany—	
Allies' Pledge, 1918	149
Asquith, 1918, 1920	148, 154
Birkenhead, Lord, 1921	149
Churchill, 1918, 1921	4, 148, 149
Claims—Total	160
Coalition Policy	149
Geddes, Auckland, 1918	148
Geddes, Eric, 1918	148
Germany Must Pay	2
Indemnities—British Share	151
Keynes—Capacity to Pay	153
Labour and Socialist Parties—Resolution, Frankfurt, 1922	154

Index

	PAGE
Liability—British Claim	150
1922	153
Total	150
Lloyd George	2, 148, 149
London Ultimatum, 1921	153
Payments—Capacity	153
Asquith, 1920	154
Keynes	153
Total 1918-1921	152
Ruhr—Invasion	151
Socialist and Labour Parties—Resolution, Frankfurt, 1922	154
REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1922	
REVENUE—Statistics	6
"REYNOLDS"	120
RODESIDA—Mandate—Land Robbery	143
ROLLING STOCK—Railway Wagons	41
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—Outrages	128
RUHR—Invasion	151
RUNCIMAN, MR.—Railway Nationalisation	41
RUSSIA—	
ARCHANGES—Expedition Against	137
Blockade	137
Coalition Policy	135
Denikin, General—Failure	138
Expeditions Against	137
Kolchak, Admiral—Failure	138
Labour Party—Policy	139
Lloyd George	138
Murmansk—Expedition Against	137
Poland—Attack by	138
Prinkipo Proposal	138
Unemployment, and	135
Wrangel, General—Failure	138
SAAR—Self-Determination	145
SAFEGUARDING OF INDUSTRIES BILL—	
Bankers' Manifesto—Extract	34
Bromfield, O.F.C.—View on	34
Coalition Statements	34
Free Trade Manifesto—Extract	34
Mond, Sir Alfred	34
SAILORS—Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
SANKEY REPORT—Coal	47
SCHOOL ATTENDANCE—Statistics	100
SCOTLAND, Secretary for—Housing	96
SECOND CHAMBER—Labour Party—Resolution	116
SELF-DETERMINATION—Asquith—Speech	145
Austria	146
Danzig	140
Labour Party—Policy	147
Lloyd George—Speech	145
Peace Treaties	145
Austria	146
Danzig	146
Poland	147
Saar	145
Tyrol	146
Upper Silesia	140
Poland	147
Saar	145
Tyrol	146
Upper Silesia	146
Wilson, President	145
SEWING COTTON—Company Profits	87
Trusts and Combines	37
SHIPBUILDING—Armaments—Limitation	31
SHIPS—Washington Disarmament Conference	31
SILESIA, UPPER—Self-Determination	146
SOAP—"Lever Combine"	36
Trusts and Combines	36
SOCIALISM, INTERNATIONAL—	
Reparations—Resolution, Frankfurt, 1922	154
SOLDIERS—Coalition Manifesto, 1918	1
Ireland—Casualties	120
"SOUTH WALES ECHO"	110
"STAR"	110
STRIKES—"Against the Community"	71
Causes	72, 73
Cotton Lock-Out, 1921	74
Facts	72
Miners' Lock-Out, 1921	74
Railway Strike, 1918	73

Index

	PAGE
SUBMARINES—Washington Disarmament Conference	32
SUFFRAGE—Adult—Labour Party Resolution	122
SUGAR—Taxation	6, 23
"SUNDAY CHRONICLE"	110, 120
"SUNDAY EXPRESS"	119
"SUNDAY HERALD"	119
"SUNDAY ILLUSTRATED"	119
SUNDAY NEWSPAPERS	119
"SUNDAY PICTORIAL"	119
SUPER-TAX—Revenue, 1921	9
Statistics	9
TAILORING TRADE—Trade Board	62
TARIFF QUESTION—Bankers' Manifesto	34
Coalition Manifesto 1918	1
Fiscal System	35
TAXATION—Beer	23
Capital Levy	24
Education	101
High Taxes One Cause of Unemployment	23
Income	8
Indirect Taxes	6, 23
Land	10
Revenue	24
Sugar	23
Tea	23
Tobacco	23
Trade—McKenna Duties	35
TAXATION—Local—Rates	13
TEA—Taxation	6, 23
TEACHERS—Pensions	102
Salaries	102
"TIMES"	120
TOBACCO—Taxation	6, 11, 23
TRADE—Business Men's Protest	34
Exports	34, 55
Fiscal System—Lloyd George	34
Imports	34
Slump	34
Statistics	34
Taxation—McKenna Duties	35
Unemployment	34, 54
TRADE BOARDS—Administrative Committee Report	461
Employers' Objections Analysed	62
Employers' Pressure	61
Government Inaction and Opposition	60
How they are Attacked	60
Investigations in Progress	60
Investigators Dismissed	60
Labour Party—Resolution	63
Ministry of Labour	62
Opposition—Kinds of	61
Present Situation	60
Resolutions	61
Tailors' Views—Respoke	62
Tribute	61
TRADE DISPUTES—Statistics	72
TRADE FACILITIES ACT	56
TRADE UNION CONGRESS—Egypt	132
Membership Statistics	78
Unemployment	53, 54
Unions—Statistics	78
TRADE UNIONS—Attacks on	76, 80
Bright, John, 1860	76
Churchill, Winston, 1906, 1920	76, 78
Ex-Servicemen—Apprenticeships	86
Bricklayers—Unemployed	84
Building Trade—Unemployed	84
Carpenters' Case	84
Demobilisation Problems	83
Dilution—Quarantines	85
Engineering Trade—Unemployed	83
Facts of the Case	83
Government's Housing Failure	85
Housing—Government's Failure	85
Land Settlement	87
Training Schemes	85
Morning Post and T.U. Finance	90
Training Schemes—Statistics	86
Foreign Countries—Statistics	70
Industrial Conference, 1919	3
International	78

Index

	PAGE
Labour's Big Battalions	76
Membership—Statistics	77
Morris, William, 187	76
Recommendation—1919	3
Statistics	77
Foreign Countries	76
Industries	77
Trade Union Congress	78
Membership—Statistics	78
Unions—Statistics	78
Unemployment and Funds	59
TRUSTS AND COMBINES—Castings, Light	39
Castings, Pipe	39
Cement	39
Cotton, Sewing	37
Cut Nails	40
Electric Lamps	37
Explosives	38
Light Castings	39
Motor Fuel	38
Nails, Cut	40
Pipes and Castings	39
Railway	41
Sewing Cotton	37
Soap	36
Yeast	36
TUBERCULOSIS—Housing and Health	94
TYROL—Self-Determination	146
UNEMPLOYMENT—	
Acts, 1920, 1921	58
Benefits	58, 59
Coalition—Action—Failure	53
Promises	61
Education—Coalition Action	56
Emigration—Lloyd George Speech	59
Ex-Servicemen	83
Grants Committee	56
High Taxes, One Cause of	23
Hours of Work—Coalition Action	57
Housing—Coalition Action	57
Insurance—Out-of-Work Pay	59
Juveniles, Employment of—Labour Party Proposals	54
Labour—Unskilled	57
Labour Party—Conference, 1921	51
Manifesto	53
Policy	51
Resolutions	50, 51
Trade Reconstruction—Proposals	54
Lloyd George—Promises	51
London Labour Party Proposals	54
Maintenance	53
Manifesto	53
Out-of-Work Pay—Statistics	50
Out-Relief—Statistics	59
Poor-Law Relief	58
Rates	57
Relief Work, Payment for—Coalition Action	135
Russia	50
Statistics	50
Trade Depression	35
Trade Facilities Act	56
Trade Reconstruction	53
Trade Union Congress—Manifesto	53
Trade Reconstruction—Proposals	54
Trade Union Funds—Distribution	59
Wages—Coalition Action	57
UNEMPLOYMENT AGENCIES—Washington Convention	64
UPPER SILESIA—Self-Determination	146
VOTES FOR WOMEN	122
WAGES—Agriculture	89, 91
Catering Trade	63
Changes by Agreement	71
Cotton Lock-out, 1921	74
Miners	74
Miners' Lock-out, 1921	74
Profits and Wages	69
Railway Strike, 1919	73
Reductions	60, 71
Slump	69
Statistics	69, 70
"Strikes Against the Community"	71
Trade Boards	80
Unemployment—Coalition Action	57
Workers' Losses	69
WAGONS—Railway	41

Index

	PAGE
WAR, THE GREAT—Debts	25, 26
Germany—Indemnities and Reparation	148
WASHINGTON CONVENTIONS	64
Children—Employment	64
Conventions Adopted	64
Employment—Young Persons	64
Excuses for Violation	64
Government's Failure	64
Government's Record	64
Hours	64
Labour Exchanges	64
Labour Party—Policy	66
—Resolution	66
Maternity	65
Ratification	64
Unemployment Agencies	64
Women—Employment	64
WASHINGTON DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE	31
WEALTH—Analysis, 1914	8
Capital Levy	24
Distribution of Incomes	9
Statistics	8, 9
" WEEKLY DISPATCH "	119
" WESTMINSTER GAZETTE "	120
WIDOWS—Pensions	108
WILSON, PRESIDENT—Self-Determination	145
WOMAN SUFFRAGE—Addison, Dr.	122
Adult Suffrage	122
Birkenhead, Lord	123
Coalition Opposition	122
Extension—Labour Party Demands	122
Fisher, H. A. L.	123
Labour Party Bill	123, 124
Parliamentary Voters—Statistics	122
Rees, J. D.	123
Representation of the People Act, 1918	122
Votes for Women	122
Women's Emancipation Bill	122
WOMEN—Employment—Washington Convention	64
Pensions	108
Women's Emancipation Bill	122
WRANGEL, GENERAL—Russia—Failure	138
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION—Accidents	68
Employers—Uninsured	68
Holman Gregory Committee	67
Insurance Companies	68
Labour Party—Demands	68
Period of Compensation, 1912-13	67
Present Position	67
Statistics	68
YEAST—Trusts and Combines	36
" YORKSHIRE TELEGRAPH AND STAR "	119

Order

The Labour Magazine

Official Journal of the Labour Movement.

**Authoritative Articles
by Leading National
and International
Writers.**

**Indispensable to all
who wish to be well-
informed on Labour
Questions.**

**THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS,
AND THE LABOUR PARTY,
32, 33 & 34, Eccleston Sq., London S.W.1**

**SIXPENCE MONTHLY.
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION
7s. 6d. Post Free.**